DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 354 AC 003 984

By-Dixon, James

The Peace Corps in an Educating Society.

Pub Date 65

Note-71p.; Excerpts from a discussion at the Brookings Institution, July 22, 1965

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.65

Descriptors-*Cross Cultural Training, Educational Improvement, Faculty Advisors, Higher Education, Inservice Education, *Interagency Cooperation, *Training Objectives, *Universities, *Volunteer Training

Identifiers-*Peace Corps

This document is an abridged transcript of the discussion held by representative participants from educational institutions and the Peace Corps at the Brookings Institution Conference on July 22, 1965. The meeting was initiated with the belief that the academic establishment and the Peace Corps need each other. Three propositions were presented: (1) the Peace Corps should see itself as an educational institution; (2) colleges and universities should become more like the Peace Corps; (3) the relationship between the Peace Corps and American higher education should be permanently committed. As a result of this meeting, Sargeant Shriver established an Education Task Force to raise the level of Peace Corps "training" to "education" in order to see the education of Volunteers as a two- or three-year process continuing throughout their service. Among ideas from the discussion resulting in the Peace Corps' new education program were (1) a panel of faculty advisors who communicate with Volunteers and visit them overseas for inservice and completion of service conferences, and (2) appropriate recognition by colleges and universities of education for volunteer service. (se)

ED028354

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE PEACE CORPS IN AN EDUCATING SOCIETY

Excerpts from a discussion at the Brookings Institution

July 22, 1965

Dr. James Dixon
President of Antioch College
Chairman

AC003984

PARTICIPANTS

Mary Bunting, President of Radcliffe College
James P. Dixon, President of Antioch College
Leonard Duhl, Chief of Planning, National Institute of Mental Health
Alvin Eurich, President of Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies
Leonard Gernant, Director of Academic Services, Western Michigan University
Sister Jacqueline Grennan, President of Webster College
Rev. Theodore Hesburgh, President of the University of Notre Dame
Eldon Johnson, President of Great Lakes Colleges Association
J. Martin Klotsche, Chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Donald N. Michael, Resident Fellow, Institute for Policy Studies
David Riesman, Department of Social Relations, Harvard University
John R. Seeley, Center for Advanced Studies in the Behavioral Sciences
Ralph Smuckler, Dean of International Programs, Michigan State University
Benson Snyder, Psychiatrist-in-Chief, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

From the Peace Corps

F. Kingston Berlew, Acting Associate Director for Volunteers
Abraham Carp, Director of Selection
Ernest Fox, former Peace Corps Volunteer from Ethiopia, now in law school at Berkeley
William Josephson, General Counsel
John L. Kennedy, Consultant on Planning; Chairman, Psychology Department, Princeton University
Roger Landrum, Training Officer, returned Peace Corps Volunteer from the University of Nigeria
Donovan McClure, Associate Director for Public Affairs
Jules Pagano, Acting Director of University Relations and Training
Charles Patterson, Acting Associate Director for Program Development and Operations
David Szanton, former Peace Corps Volunteer from the Philippines, now in graduate studies at the University of Chicago
Warren W. Wiggins, Deputy Director
Harris Wofford, Associate Director for Planning, Evaluation, and Research; Chairman of Education Task Force

A NOTE ABOUT THE MEETING

This Brookings discussion may mark a turning point in the Peace Corps' relationship to education.

As a result of this meeting, Sargent Shriver established an Education Task Force to raise the level of Peace Corps "training" to "education," to develop a comprehensive new partnership with American colleges and universities, and to see the education of Volunteers not as two or three months of preparation but as a two- or three-year process continuing throughout the Volunteers' service.

Many ideas discussed in the following abridged transcript are ingredients of the Peace Corps' new education program: campus seminars for interested students; the preparation of new material, especially by returned Volunteers, which reflect their complex responsibilities; a panel of faculty advisers who will communicate with Volunteers, visit them overseas for in-service or completion-of-service conferences, and in some cases serve on the staff; encouragement of independent Volunteer study and research; appropriate recognition by colleges and universities of the education involved in Volunteer service. (See Mr. Shriver's memorandum of August 13, 1965, in the appendix.)

The meeting was suggested by President James Dixon of Antioch (on behalf of a small committee of interested educators) who wrote Mr. Shriver that the academic establishment and the Peace Corps "need each other." The March Conference on the Returned Peace Corps Volunteer had convinced them that the Peace Corps was "the most eloquent example of institutionalizing academic freedom within the federal government that has ever existed." But he and other educators at that conference felt that there were conflicts within both the Peace Corps and the institutions of higher education, and that further steps could be taken together to make better use of an "extraordinary educational opportunity." (See Dr. Dixon's letter in the appendix.)

The initial questions presented to the meeting were these three propositions by John Seeley of Brandeis:

(1) That the Peace Corps should see itself as an educational institution, and become from top to bottom, beginning to end, a university.

(2) That colleges and universities should become more like the Peace Corps.

(3) That the relationship between the Peace Corps and American higher education should move from a flirtation or collision to a marriage.

Also on the agenda were programs to incorporate Peace Corps service in college or university curriculums, announced after the March Conference: the Western Michigan University and Franconia College five-year "Peace Corps B.A.'s"; a Michigan State University Master's in Teaching through service in Nigeria.

Among the many points in the following transcript that are contributing to the Task Force's work, none was more provocative than the plea by Sister Jacqueline Grennan of Webster College that the Peace Corps embody in its Volunteer education the variety and autonomy of the overseas service. Instead of a new education program being "orchestrated," she hoped it would be more of a "jazz band" that would "let the trumpet go if the trumpet makes it." The Peace Corps should encourage American colleges and universities to participate in the Volunteers' education in a great variety of ways, she urged. But she asked: Can any institution with the size and responsibilities of the Peace Corps really encourage 175 different approaches? Can a bureaucracy let the trumpet go?

The Brookings meeting encouraged the Peace Corps to make and continue the attempt.

Harris Wofford
Education Task Force

(Programs and working papers of the Education Task Force and the Report of the Conference on the Returned Peace Corps Volunteer are available upon request.)

DISCUSSION ON THE PEACE CORPS IN AN EDUCATING SOCIETY

Brookings Institution, July 22, 1965

DR. JAMES DIXON: One way to look at our presence here is to say that both the Peace Corps itself and the academic community recognize the Peace Corps as an educational institution. There are various questions raised as to the nature of its educational mission: What does the Peace Corps itself feel it requires to meet the obligations of its educational mission? What does the "Establishment" (if you want to differentiate between the Peace Corps and the Educational Establishment) think the Peace Corps needs in order to be responsible in its educational mission? And what are possible further collaborations between the Peace Corps and established educational facilities through America and perhaps throughout the world?

One of the reasons for calling this group together was concern expressed by some of the folks who participated in the March Conference on Returned Volunteers, a concern which expressed itself by saying, "Yes, this is a remarkable educational institution, but it is not behaving like the educational institution it might be."

SISTER JACQUELINE GRENNAN: There is another side of it. The Peace Corps isn't behaving as well as we think an ideal educational institution ought, but in many ways it is behaving better than many conventional educational institutions. There are so many elements of the Peace Corps experience that we really need to introduce strongly into the educational established order. One of the reasons we don't want it to miss its potential is that if it is going to be an infection center, then it better be as good a one as we can make it.

DR. LEONARD DUHL: The fact is that we are becoming an educating society in which the university no longer has a monopoly on education. There are many different organizations that are participating in education--some successfully, some quite unsuccessfully and some detrimentally. The Peace Corps was created in part as a response to the failure of the universities to fulfill certain objectives in education for a certain segment of American youth. There is the need not only for a Peace Corps, but for many other organizations which together would make up a comprehensive educating society. I would like to challenge the universities to assume the responsibility for orchestrating this new educating society, using the Peace Corps as a take-off point and perhaps tying into it other kinds of agencies and institutions in the future.

SISTER JACQUELINE: We're nearing the nerve center of a problem that is so much bigger than the Peace Corps. I have been frustrated the last few months with two things I have been working with. One is Head Start and the other is the Regional Educational Laboratories. In both cases I had something to do with formation of policy. Then I went out to my own local area, sat in on meetings there and was almost entirely frustrated. You hear everybody at the table not looking at what it is possible to do but looking at what this does to the established order of the school system, of the university, of the graduate schools. Prestige is the focus of interest. It isn't at all the terms that Len is talking about, the great educating society with somebody orchestrating.

And I just hope it's a jazz band kind of function rather than a symphony orchestra. Whoever directs the thing has got to let the trumpet go if the trumpet makes it. But I don't think that is what we are getting out of it. The War on Poverty was supposed to bring together all these elements in a new scheme but you get the public school system grabbing most of the elements of it. We just can't afford to miss this opportunity. The vested interest positions are killing us. Maybe the Peace Corps can have an impact here.

JOHN SEELEY: Could I refer to some of the unnecessary dichotomies I see here, and saw not only at the Returned Volunteers Conference but at Berkeley and all centers where I've been the last year. There are the dichotomies thrown up between "experiential education" and "intellectual education," with the curious result that those who praise and say they have had experience drink up anything you can give them by way of intellectual form to give that experience meaning. It's as though they have lived in the desert for two or three years. And, conversely, many intellectuals are excited and enriched and moved by the experiences that VISTA people or the people in the Peace Corps bring back with them. I would like to avoid the notion that somehow there is an experiential education and there's an intellectual education and that the people who participate in these things have really nothing to say or to do with each other.

The other kind of split is the dichotomy between "ethically committed" and "value-free." By and large at the Returned Volunteers Conference the Volunteers talked and acted as though (and indeed there was something to be said for it) they were the representatives of ethical commitment and we were the representatives of, at best, detachment and, at worst, indifference. Another aspect of this had to do with cogency. They felt that what they were doing and thinking about was always cogent to something they could explain to us, where in our professional lives we could not. If we knew what we were doing and why we were doing it, we certainly hadn't communicated it to them.

Then another and perhaps more difficult split has to do with immediacy and remoteness in a time scale. They feel that the world will not wait as long as we who are older and wiser--or perhaps older and more foolish--are prepared to wait. In any case, this gap has to be healed.

Somewhere across these lines, as well as across the alleged generational split, which is a mixture of these things, a set of important institutions has to operate that indicates the complimentality of all these pairs of terms. This is what I hope might come out of our thoughts today.

DR. DIXON: We are, I think, struggling to accept a definition of education that is in itself a little radical.

KINGSTON BERLEW: An assumption is made that there is an important relationship between experience and education. I would benefit from hearing educators define how an experience like the Peace Corps or the poverty program is really related to what we call education.

MR. SEELEY: If we try to answer the question, "What should all education be?", I think we are facing an unnecessary difficulty here. An easier question might be the one asked by a growing body of young people who say in effect: "In a limited way I know what my mission is. Now what I would like to know is what you know that would be helpful to me in the pursuit and in the reexamination of that mission." I would like to take that easier question for this meeting: How might we or someone respond to that?

MR. BERLEW: It might help if I said why I asked my question. When we talk with our Peace Corps Representatives overseas and some of our own program people here in Washington, they often say: "Why do universities want to do this? Are they really just interested in saying that two years of Peace Corps experience is equivalent to one year of formal academic education? If so, fine. Or is there something in addition that they want to do--that they want to superimpose upon the main mission of the Peace Corps? How is that going to affect our job?" That is the reason why I ask what you mean by the relationship between our Peace Corps experience and education.

DAVID RIESMAN: The better the educational institution, the more likely it is to give students the feeling that they are incompetent and mediocre, and that they are not really very brilliant unless they are fantastically talented. If they are only moderately talented, say, in the top one-tenth of one per cent of the population, they are likely to go to a graduate school or a good undergraduate institution and come out with the feeling of being only first rate second-raters. One of the great problems of American higher education today is to give people confidence that they can do things that they haven't done before so that they don't always play to their strengths and go on doing all their lives the kinds of things that in the sixth grade they did well enough.

One of the great educative experiences in the Peace Corps is being faced with impossible tasks, first in the training program and then in the field. I think they could come back from this experience with the feeling that the academic joint could also be cased and mastered. The Volunteers get experience in mastery and in learning things fast. It really doesn't matter much what one learns in this way, provided one gains increasingly the sense that one can learn and that one can go on learning and that one can do all sorts of things which seemed to one's own definition of oneself out of the question.

LEONARD GERNANT: Your question, Mr. Berlew, about the sudden interest of universities in the Peace Corps may be cleared up by simply stating that in the past several years universities have more and more bridged this gap between experiential and intellectual education in many ways in many different curricula. Let me give one example: When we train people in the field of occupational therapy, we see to it that part of the curriculum has in it at least nine to twelve months' internship away from campus in three different kinds of hospitals. Here is where the intellectual and the experiential come together. Now that's only one example and institutions all over the country have done social work in this way, and teaching too, of course. I think the interest of the university in relating to the Peace Corps is simply an extension of that whole experience. We know it works in these other fields and we feel it might work in this area. So I regard it as not a brand new idea but merely as an extension of what has been going on in relating the experiential and the intellectual.

MR. RIESMAN: I think we need here what was done at the NIMH discussion*/ following last spring's Returned Volunteers Conference, when one of the young Peace Corps people said, "You, not us." You began, Jim Dixon, by talking about the academic community; we talked about the university. It was a tremendous mistake. You've got all the different varieties of academic institutions. You've got entirely different problems in places where occupational therapy would be considered almost degrading as education.

---

*/ A Discussion on Returned Peace Corps Volunteers, March 8, 1965, by the National Institute of Mental Health's Seminar on "Social and Physical Environmental Variables as Determinants of Mental Health." Copies of excerpts from this discussion are available.

ALVIN EURICH: If we look back over the history of higher education, I think we can see that colleges and universities have had great difficulty in trying to extend the learning experience. For the most part we have done so by creating new institutions. Go back to the introduction of laboratory work in the sciences when Professor Silliman introduced laboratory work in chemistry at Yale. This was not regarded as proper academic work by the rest of the academic community and the Sheffield Scientific Institution had to be founded. Then we came to the adaptation to an agricultural society and we had to set up land grant colleges. We come along to the more technological age, and we had to set up new technological institutions. When we wanted to broaden the base further in the training of post-high school students, we set up junior colleges. More recently we have set up almost a new system of education carried on by our industrial corporations, which amounts now to somewhere between three and four billion dollars a year in expenditure. This was set up because our educational institutions were not meeting the needs of the industrial corporations.

Now we are confronted with another problem, the international one. Doesn't this history suggest that we need to approach this as we did the past cases through some new institution rather than expect that the existing institutions are going to change very rapidly.

MR. SEELEY: I am unhappy in that what we seem to be thinking about is a continuation of the somewhat unhappy process in which education has tacked on one piece after another as a response or an adaptation to a passing or historic social need. What I had hoped for was something far different, far more transformative, and in a sense far more in the nature of returning to what I would regard as the primitive church of higher education.

The original task of the ancient university was to think and act and debate so that society would be constituted and reformed and liberated. It's now the world society which is so immediately real. And, in this light, I see a mutually re-creative linkage between the Peace Corps (which already is engaged in somehow knitting up a new world and making a new society) and universities today.

The debate about how this remaking of the polity can be done and what must be known to do it should be the central task of the university, not a peripheral or segmental task like occupational therapy or the teaching of teachers. This was the classic crux of liberal education: How do you understand and remake the world? What I was hoping was that the university might return to this revivified by the contact with those who are actually out there doing this, and that they in turn would be better informed so that there might be a revival of both.

MR. EURICH: The Peace Corps is an illustration of what I was speaking of. Colleges and universities aren't doing it. So we set up a new organization, the Peace Corps, to meet a new need. Now it seems to me the problem we have is how can we relate this to our existing institutions.

DR. DIXON: How can one discover whether the virus is virile?

CHARLES PATTERSON: The Peace Corps has to raise another question and that is whether in any effort to bring these organizations, theoretically going in the same direction, together, a certain kind of disease might be caught by the Peace Corps.

By its very nature the universities and colleges call for a certain kind of systemization and the Peace Corps, of course, has its systems also. These systems have been developed to reach certain goals. When you try to marry those two institutions, at what level, for example, in the mind of the working Volunteer in Africa or in Asia, does the education system come in? Or is the university just going to say, "We don't need to project our system into your activity because we accept it per se as a part of our goal"? At that operating level, where the Volunteer is doing a particular job in a village or a school, is the university going to project itself as an institution into that Volunteer's life? And if that is done, doesn't the Peace Corps catch some kind of disease?

MARY BUNTING: You're speaking to one of my real worries as I sit here. There seems to be a feeling that something won't really count about the Peace Corps unless we give academic credit.

MR. SEELEY: We've gone off on substantially different lines of thought. The last thing in my mind, and one of the few things I hadn't heard from the Returned Volunteers at the Conference, was a request for credit. In fact they sort of pushed it away, saying: "Don't give us credit, don't even call us Volunteers, don't give us special names." What they seemed to be asking at the Conference and elsewhere was: "Why didn't somebody tell me that, when I was out in the field? Now I come back, now my professors tell me things that would have been very useful to me then, but I was out of touch with them." I was speaking less of credit and hours and such things, and much more of the maintenance of the intimate contact between those who could help them put things into intellectual and other perspectives. They kept saying: "If I'd only thought of that--if somebody had told me this," which any good professor might have told them if he had been in contact with them in the field.

SISTER JACQUELINE: But I think there is a deeper tension involved in Mrs. Bunting's question. If we think of credit as the price tag for education, the goal for education, if this is why people get an education, then we would terribly dissipate the energy of the Peace Corps by making the price paid more important than the doing. This may show what I think is the disease of higher education. If we think of credit as the description of what happens, then I think we're back in the dichotomy between the experiential and the theoretical. The position I'd like to fight for is that the theoretical is the conceptualizing step of experience. All too many parts of the educational establishment are caught with a terrible smugness, thinking only that that which is theoretical is worthy of credit. If we are going to live with reward systems, then I want the reward systems to be descriptive of the exciting phenomena, and I would want to fight for the experiential.

MRS. BUNTING: My problem is a different one. As a scientist quite used to giving credit for laboratory, credit for the Peace Corps seems to be analogous to the laboratory. From this standpoint I don't mind giving credit at all. From the standpoint of the university, I worry about the people who think: "I've learned so much from bringing up my family. How much credit can you give for this?"

DR. BENSON SNYDER: A young man whom I have talked with over a period of years recently entered the Peace Corps, it seems to me, in part out of a desire to hold on to an adolescent view of the world. He wanted to bring plumbing to Africa. He thought this would convey something of a good life in terms of cleanliness and purity--these are terms that he used. He was constantly looking, in almost every encounter that he had, in his friends, in the classroom, in his relationship with professors, for an indication that he'd been a good boy, that he'd done well. Obviously the credit system he'd been raised in had served this purpose very well.

I will be very interested to see what happens to him over two years in the Peace Corps. The actual experience may well alter all this for him; something that he wasn't bargaining for may happen. He may be able to go beyond the point at which he's motivated by getting approval or getting credits in the usual sense of the word, to a point where he begins to care about people, about others, and therefore to expand in a way that he hasn't yet. He might then begin to use his very real competence for different ends.

Many of the Volunteers that I've talked to here and before and some other students who are going into the Peace Corps, are going in precisely because they already know that their problem is that they aren't sure that they're using their competence correctly. They want an experience to test them. This other boy doesn't know it. He's going in a little bit like Don Quixote. What we're hoping is to provide them an experience that often they don't get in higher education. There is a question of whether there's anything educational institutions can do in what we're talking about. It would be a shame if the Peace Corps now turned around and gave credit in such a way that it reinforced our plumber.

MRS. BUNTING: It isn't that they're asking for it. As I heard it, we're asking for it.

J. MARTIN KLOTSCHE: Isn't the real problem that we have not yet in our educational institutions found any way of measuring Peace Corps experience other than by the traditional method of credit? We attempt to use the traditional method of evaluating a student's performance in the classroom and apply it to an experience such as the Peace Corps. This is a completely invalid assumption. We need to think not in terms of credit but in terms of value to the individual, and we haven't learned in our educational institutions yet how to assess this, how to appraise it, how to give it a mark.

MRS. BUNTING: Do we need to?

MR. KLOTSCHE: No, I'm not sure that we do.

ROGER LANDRUM: For many Volunteers, Peace Corps service is, in one aspect, independent graduate study, in the liberal arts sense of study. Most of us struggle with it because there is no help in that aspect of our work. The Peace Corps Representative overseas gives a different sort of service. His attempt is to preserve the functional aspect of the Peace Corps. You have to fight that off to preserve the educational aspect. Before I went overseas I had two and a half years of graduate school. I still wasn't really equipped in the non-Western setting for intellectual exploration in the cognitive realm, which I was struggling to do. There was no one available who was either interested or capable in this particular aspect to serve me. God knows the Peace Corps Rep wasn't at all interested in that aspect.

But now that I've come back, it's immensely important to me that the universities recognize this educational aspect. I wanted to go back into the university, and integrate what crystalized out of the Peace Corps experience into a degree. It should be worth something. I have to be able to sell it in hard cash terms or else I'm wasting time compared to others of my own capability who stayed at home and got the sales cards.

MR. EURICH: Doesn't this give us one clue toward bringing together the college and universities with the Peace Corps, namely through a system of advisors?

MR. PATTERSON: It also gives me cause for concern, because the minute that two years of Peace Corps service is looked upon as something lost from two years that could have been spent in writing papers, we are changing the goals and purposes of the Peace Corps. It seems to me that you've got a flow between the Peace Corps and the universities. The flow starts with the fact that the substantial body of Volunteers come from the centers of higher learning. The Peace Corps as an institution hooks back into the university through its training programs. At this point the universities and the Peace Corps are close together. It's in the third step that you have the divergence, when the Peace Corps puts the product of this happy collaboration with institutions of higher learning in the field to do a particular job in a given area. The question is what we can do in that third area to bring about the happy collaboration that we've already had up to then.

HARRIS WOFFORD: I don't see the contradiction. As a Peace Corps Representative who tried to encourage what Roger Landrum was desiring, I saw a lot of evidence of benefits to the Peace Corps from what he's talking about. I'll give one case. A Volunteer with a first-rate spirit from a third-rate college was put in a very difficult school out in a desert town and was badly bored. A wandering anthropologist we had consulting on our staff for a while came through and said: "How can you be bored? You're sitting at a great marketplace of Africa. The market and its role in development and change, has hardly been touched in the social sciences. Learn Arabic, case this place, know this market town inside and out, and you're half way to your degree." That Volunteer came alive, he became fluent in Arabic, our most fluent Volunteer. He knew practically every storekeeper in the town. To go through that place with him, visiting the shops or homes, seeing how much he knew, how well he was accepted, was one of the great joys of bumping along the roads of Ethiopia in a jeep. Anyone would rate this fellow among the most outstanding of the first three hundred Volunteers. He, by the way, now jokingly tells how he had been almost selected out in training for inadequate ability to communicate with people.

MR. KLOTSCHE: This is a good example of the need for finding some kind of method of assessing accomplishments other than the credit device or other than the notion that one year of work in the Peace Corps is equivalent to one year of university work. In terms of the university, how do you assess the kind of experience this chap had? I don't think you assess it in terms of X number of credits or a certain number of months equivalent to Peace Corps service.

JOHN KENNEDY: In the American university we support a great many things that we don't measure academically. How do you measure participation in football? I wonder whether what we're talking about is curricular versus extra-curricular activities. We have been talking about Peace Corps experience as a candidate for inclusion in curricular concerns. Possibly it's an example of extra-curricular activities.

DR. DUHL: The use of the words curricular and extra-curricular points up what the problem is to some of us. According to the early definitions of education, its responsibility was to deal primarily with the cognitive development of the individual. What we are seeing now is that we are moving into tremendous para-educational areas. All these para-educational areas are the new education. The cognitive aspects we can measure by these idiotic tests that my psychological colleagues have developed and by other testing devices. But the trouble is that we do not have tests to measure and evaluate all the non-cognitive things that have gone into the para-educational operation. We have only a lot of impressions. We have a lot of reactions from kids, from some of the students at Berkeley, from the Peace Corps Volunteers.

What we are really struggling for now is a new kind of educational institution where all of these are put together in one whole. When Roger Landrum was asking for a counselor or somebody to help, he was asking for somebody to bring some coherence out of all this mess that up to now is completely separated into different vertical lines. Nobody seems to be able to pull it together. We have always made the assumption in the past that if you've got a very bright kid and you feed into him cognitive knowledge in one area and a little extra-curricular knowledge in another area and a little experience in another, that somewhere in his head he will pull it all together and come out a human being who is a leader. I think we are now suddenly faced with the problem that no matter how confident an individual is, he really needs some help in making coherence out of all these separate parts and operations. One of the things I'm asking for, is that the university reorganize itself instead of along vertical lines maybe along some kind of horizontal lines which permit the different kinds of organization.

Now, I go one step further: para-educational activities can't take place only within the walls of the university. They are taking place all over the world right now. I suggest that the counselor that Roger is asking for be some place in the university, and that university people assume the leadership for pulling together these various things in the para-educational areas so the students can get some kind of wholeness and we as professionals can answer the question Jack Seeley posed. Jack mentioned that the Volunteers asked, "How can we have the knowledge that is useful to cope with the particular kind of world that we're facing?"

MR. KENNEDY: Roger, do you want a professor or a coach?

MR. LANDRUM: I'm indignant about relegating the Peace Corps experience to an extra-curricular arrangement. I played football in college, and I belonged to a fraternity, and to compare those experiences with Peace Corps experience is nonsense. Learning Arabic is hardly comparable to learning to run around the end of a football line, in terms of measurable, objective, intellectual content. The thing that I struggled with most, academically, as a Volunteer, was integrating my intellectual interest in African literature and in the African's cognitive process in relation to my own understanding and comparing the Western and non-Western cognitive process. This was an intellectual matter which I had great difficulty dealing with. I had never studied it before.

ABRAHAM CARP: Some American institutions take a different approach to experiential factors than do others. Stanford University, which I went to and which my son goes to, probably will be one of the last ones to want to give experiential credit or to allow you to get a degree without having spent four full semesters on the campus. There are other institutions which even now outside the context of the Peace Corps try methods of giving credit for experiential background. In one sense the title of our agenda is Peace Corps Service as a Part of an A. B. Education. There are some institutions that are interested but you do have the problems of credit. One way might be for every student working toward an A. B. degree who is overseas as a Volunteer to have intimate contact with some representative of the faculty of the institution granting the degree. The other extreme would be for the university to consider Peace Corps service as obviously relevant experience not requiring any individual evaluation and for it automatically to give 10, 16 or 22 hours of credit. Probably the solution is somewhere in between. I would like to hear more discussion of the experimenting institutions and what their requirements and needs will be.

MR. EURICH: Stanford University offers credit for a year abroad at its centers.

SISTER JACQUELINE: I want to know, Harris, whether or not you think that the discovery of this first-rate spirit from a third-rate college was as important for the wandering anthropologist as it was for the Volunteer. Was he saying that he would make a concession, "You're halfway toward a degree," or was he perhaps recognizing something he wished he could give more kids who are going toward a degree? Was he recognizing a superior kind of contribution to the process?

MR. WOFFORD: Oh, yes.

SISTER JACQUELINE: I think the question is not whether we are giving credit in our stereotyped notion but are we recognizing the organic wholeness of the process? If we start with a mechanistic plan for giving credit for Peace Corps and call it the "Five-Year Plan" this scares me. Two years in Podunk and one year abroad and one year back at Podunk! But if this particular person, together with his mentor, conceived this experience as a positive input to the whole organic experience then I'd like to see us free enough to say, "Fine. This is relevant to the way you see it." But educational institutions don't want to do this. It's messy. The registrars would have a fit.

MRS. BUNTING: The other approach is to establish a new advanced degree in whatever it is we are talking about with as clearly defined a concept as you can. Then persons having these abilities and skills get this advanced degree. When you get this concept across, then you release the different institutions to say, "That's something valuable, we can accept this much within our undergraduate structure." And another will do it another way, and so on. I think this is one way to get across the values we want without tying them into the credit system. Let the institutions do it their own way.

MR. GERNANT: We have some rather new wine in this Peace Corps and I think the trouble with all of us at the universities is we're trying to dump this new wine into the old bottles. I think we've got to create some new things to hold all this in, not only rearrange our building blocks but think up some new building blocks. But what Sister Jacqueline says about dealing with these registrars, for example, is just a fact of life you have to face.

SISTER JACQUELINE: Face, but not accept.

MR. GERNANT: That's right. One of the toughest things we have all over the country is to get this thing restructured in such a way that we have some fluidity here rather than to pour all these people like Roger into the old regulations. Now one more thing. I'm getting eager to have these young people come back into our colleges as faculty members and as advisors. Through them we can make some of these changes we are talking about here.

MR. RIESMAN: The first issue raised by Roger seems to me to be the dialectic between masochism and opportunity: whether you can ask or should ask of Peace Corps people that they regard their experience as a thing for its own sake only and not relevant to a career line. Perhaps we can come back to that later.

My own feeling about what is happening in our social sciences is that it is getting more and more difficult to make use of the man Harris Wofford talked about or the person Roger Landrum became. I think it helpful to look at these difficulties for a moment. In anthropology today--and I would like to see this not too old bottle made new again--less and less regard is paid to a person who goes out to the field and comes back with the total picture, the old-fashioned ethnographer rather than someone who adds something to the understanding of the details of kinship or linguistic structure. I'm not against the latter but I would like to see a more open-minded anthropology.

In sociology, matters are even worse. There is great room for people who have access to different kinds of populations, who can, for instance in America, interview the upper class (it's very easy to get people to be downwardly mobile; everybody loves to do that--but difficult to get somebody with access to the upper class). But if you say, "Let's give him a degree so he can be part of the trade and make his contribution," if he hasn't passed his course in statistics and doesn't make noises like a professional, he's not "in" at the major institutions. If I say to my best undergraduate students, "Go to less prestigious institutions so you can get through with what you are rather than what you don't want to become," they don't want to do that either. What I hope for is to see the returning Volunteer not have to set up new degree programs--that would be a last resort--but go into the old degree programs so they become new again.

DR. CARP: This reminds me of our hopes about the returned war veteran in graduate school. We knew then that in some respects the language requirements for a degree in psychology were irrelevant and that there were other activities that we needed to be engaged in, like statistics, which we would rather do than pass an examination in French or German. There was considerable agitation but I think the same language requirements are still in existence in practically all of the institutions of higher learning.

SPEAKER: So it is not so easy to influence the Establishment.

DR. ELDON JOHNSON: I would like to raise a question about Harris Wofford's fellow with the third-rate background. Wasn't the Peace Corps actually more interested in what this individual was doing in the village than in the fact that an anthropologist thought he was halfway to a degree?

MR. WOFFORD: Yes. We were interested in the good results of that anthropologist's visit, in terms of what we wanted the Volunteer to do, which was to communicate, to learn, to get to know that market town.

DR. DIXON: This begins to clarify to some extent the distance which separates the educational institutions and the Peace Corps, and the distance we have to travel in the middle. The Peace Corps is more functional than educational, and the colleges more educational than functional. But this is not to say they don't have something in common. There is a continuum, and we have to find, somewhere in the middle, some meeting, some reconciliation. Perhaps the best way to find the accommodation is to stop asking the theoretical questions about this continuum. You'll always get the negative, wrong answers from the faculty or the registrar when you run them up against this in the abstract. But if you can set up a situation where you have a relationship between the Peace Corps and some institution which is willing to work closely enough with the Peace Corps, and the Peace Corps with them, in a pragmatic kind of way going against these problems to get reconciliations, to get the answers, you could probably work out something which would be of value in the long run to both and to the Volunteer.

MR. SEELEY: What is required is not an accommodation of the educational and the functional; it's the revival of education by restoring to it its functional connections, and the revival of functions by restoring to them their intellectual content. The very sickness of education and sickness of enterprise consists in the separation, which by the way is not in the traditional conception of the university -- it's a post-Renaissance heresy that somehow knowledge exists apart from the life which it enters and conversely.

SPEAKER: I trust you wouldn't press this so far that you get a complete identity.

MR. SEELEY: In principle I would press it no further than you do from moment to moment in your daily life when your thought informs your action and your action flows back into your thought. As close as we can come to that kind of intimacy without spoiling something is what I would like to see experimented with.

MR. LANDRUM: I think it should be clear that there is also a dichotomy or tension between the Peace Corps bureaucracy's reason for having them in the village, which is labor, and many of the reasons the Volunteers are there, which is labor plus something educational. There is going to have to be some stretching of the Peace Corps too--of the Peace Corps operations people--if the Peace Corps experience is going to be as educational as we try to tell people it is.

I would be very hesitant to ask people to give credit for my two years as a Volunteer as it was. However, if there had been something else built in, in terms of someone to help me crystalize the intellectual content of my experience, then it would have really meant something. But it would have been very difficult for that to happen under the present Peace Corps way of thinking about and organizing the experience.

MR. WOFFORD: The Peace Corps bureaucracy isn't doing its job if it neglects two of its three statutory purposes by thinking just about labor. Two of the three statutory purposes have to do with mutual education. Only one has to do with labor.

MRS. BUNTING: There is more to be grasped from Harris's example. It seems to me that what that anthropologist did was say: "We are after something new here. This is a research job." He got that Peace Corps person to thinking about it in those terms which released him. He wasn't worrying whether he was going to get credit. He had a way of operating that turns out to be an awfully useful way for all kinds of minds that we don't recognize can do this. We say they've got to learn, learn, learn before they can do research.

DR. DIXON: I hear two operational matters being discussed: an uneasy institution *qua* institution alliance that would be mutually advantageous and then the need for people who would perform educational functions within the Peace Corps to assist the Volunteers organize their experience in a way that would be satisfactory to them and might somehow even be recognized publicly.

MR. WOFFORD: Let me try to state the question differently, rolling together the concerns of many of us for the Peace Corps at this moment in its history. In terms of the needs of the developing world for an enormous number of agents of the twentieth century, a hundred times more than are now there, and in terms of the need of this country to participate in that process of twentieth century transformation in a way that fully engages America and relates it effectively to the world, the Peace Corps is just a few old-fashioned bombers and is only a couple of miles over the parallel.

You used the word "release." That's better than talking about bombers. But there is a bomb analogy we might keep in mind, the releasing of the power of the atom. In terms of releasing the academic power in this country, of releasing the power of the student body, in order for us to draw the human and intellectual resources we need in this operation, we have to learn how to split the atom of the younger generation and of the academic community. We don't know whether a new degree or the five-year Peace Corps B. A. degree or a new educational institution is the answer. But the Peace Corps will fail and probably peter out unless in the months ahead we find the way to break through to an entirely new level of operation on the campuses of this country. Perhaps we should do this by following several different paths. This is how we got the atomic bomb--by following different paths in several universities. My concern is to get the three or five or ten paths that we can go down very seriously.

REV. THEODORE HESBURGH: There is something a little sick about the present system of higher education. Looking at its total spectrum, all the way from lower education through Ph. D. and post-doctoral, I think it might best be described in the favorite adjective of modern youngsters, "unreal." It's possible to go through the whole system and become highly competent in a very small area of knowledge and yet never to learn anything about oneself, what kind of a person one is, what kind of values one has, what depth or lack of generosity one has, what sense of service one has.

We put people in this thing almost as participants in an oriental dance, where they go through all these motions and yet learn very little about themselves or the world they live in, or about other people, although they may learn a great deal in this amorphous area we've been calling "cognitive."

If the Peace Corps has anything to contribute at this stage of the game, it is to give an infusion of some new life. I don't care whether you call it a virus--I prefer to put it in a positive sense and call it an enzyme. In doing this something happens to all the individuals in the system, the students and the Establishment.

Some of the ways we're trying to do it at this point represent a kind of shotgun marriage, because we're trying to get the best of both worlds. We want all the values of the new experience that comes through Peace Corps. At the same time we want all the rewards that come through being a participant in this classical dance, where one is part of the company and one competes, one performs, and after a while one gets the medal as part of the guild.

What the Peace Corps really has to offer is a vital life experience that heightens the receptivity of persons. The Volunteer is not the same person in the system after he returns. He begins to see relevance in things because he's been up against situations and dilemmas where he doesn't have answers. He's more hungry for answers. He has a much deeper sense of the challenge in the world than when he was reading books and talking in the unreal world of the campus.

The Peace Corps has to have a much bigger impact than it is having now on the total educational system. I would settle on an informal but a greater and more focused impact. We talk about the Peace Corps as though we're talking about ten thousand students out of five million--that isn't a very enormous reality. It's a small percentage. If it were ten times as large it would have a greater impact.

But that's not going to happen unless somehow we create a sense of appreciation for the experience, a sense that one is not a whole person without it. One will not learn well without it. One will not relate to the world in years to come without it.

This is a dimension that cannot be had in a classroom. It requires a certain activity, requires involvement, requires commitment, requires dedication. This is the kind of revolt against modern values that the Peace Corps offers young people, a kind of structured revolt, a moral equivalent to war.

We must accept as part of the whole educational system this experience of service. I don't care whether you call it Peace Corps or what you call it--there are many kinds of service going on. Some of it goes on in mental hospitals, some of it goes on in teaching kids in the slums, some goes on in summer commitments overseas or, in this country, in migrant camps and all the rest. Some of it goes on in a religious context, some in a secular. But this experience, whether given credit or not given credit, is important.

It's hard to universalize. Some veterans after the war had had enormous experiences packed into two or three years and they had grown mightily. Others might as well have spent the war in the Brooklyn Navy Yard, for all the effect they got out of it. The same is true of Volunteers. People are different, situations are different, and reactions are different.

Therefore, it is difficult to equate X years of service with X number of credits, but I am not sure it is that important. We have a dean who is completely unorthodox. One youngster may come back from Peace Corps service and talk with him for a while and he finds out that he is indeed unchanged. He says, "Well, you go back into the system." Another youngster comes back and is enormously changed and the dean says, "You're going to jump a year." He's got no rules for it, I don't know what he does with transcripts and registrars, but he makes a judgment on what happened to this youngster. If something happened, he gives him the equivalent boost in time spent in the total educational process and makes up for it in other ways. Now we do this even within the system in pushing kids ahead to advanced standing.

The central task is to multiply the Peace Corps ten times by recognizing and being enthusiastic about the fact that it provides education with a whole new dimension that will vivify the students and also those members of the faculty that have contact with those students, and will infuse into the present lock-step system a chance of breaking out of that classical dance and getting an experience that will heighten every other experience that follows. I'm for using all the possible relationships, formal and informal, between the universities and the Peace Corps to see that something does happen when there's a receptive administration which wants something to happen, whether it's a wandering anthropologist or just some visiting fireman.

Within each individual school we must do what we can to give some recognition to what has happened. But more than that we must say loud and clear that this experience is needed today. The world needs it and we need it as individuals.

And we may have to do some other things that I won't even mention now because they're political at the moment, to give the kind of recognition nationally that I think is deserved to this kind of service. U Thant, in a recent speech, said that this should be a normal part of a person's education throughout the world. If we take that seriously, it's another way of bringing the world together.

WILLIAM JOSEPHSON: It's comfortable to find myself in essential agreement with Father Ted. Talk about credit, new academic institutions, and degree programs is talk about what is least valuable, least attractive and least important in the educational system. I would be surprised, for example, if people went to Radcliffe because they got a B.A. Perhaps they do, but I would certainly hate, if I were President of Radcliffe, to admit it. In my experience, universities heave a substantial sigh of relief when they give students a B.A. A large segment of this year's graduating class--most of whom are not qualified to be graduate students--have gone off to work for Standard Oil or IBM, and for some reason you don't have to worry about them anymore.

Going off into the Peace Corps is a very different kind of action on the part of these students. First of all, it is not a career for them. It is commitment to a further transitional experience. Secondly, it takes place in an extremely rich cultural environment, where the individual has great latitude and a fair amount of control of his own time, an environment in which further education, in a sense that should be meaningful to any university, can take place.

It seems to me if I were president of a university, and I knew that such an environment existed, I would feel a responsibility to take advantage of it. That would be a benefit to my institution, to my country, to the individual involved. I would see what I could do as an educator to wring advantage from my former students' participation in this rich environment. Now if those students then respond in a way that I, as an educator, find relevant, sooner or later somebody down in the registrar's office is going to award points, give somebody a year's credit or maybe even give him a degree. But that really isn't the essential thing. The essential thing is the opportunity that Peace Corps service very genuinely presents for the universities to continue a very meaningful process of education that only just began in college.

DONALD MICHAEL: I find myself deeply confused at this moment. Harris Wofford says that the Peace Corps faces a crisis, has to do something fast, has to do something within the next year or two. And yet these recent comments are directed at changes of perspectives and operating procedures in universities, among youth, among their parents, among the whole society, which inevitably will take a long time to accomplish. We'll have to set up new social institutions, some kind of social feedback to demonstrate to academia and kids and parents that the kind of new relationship we've been talking about is a worthwhile one. It takes time to establish the kind of contagion that would generate a large population of Peace Corps Volunteers such as we have talked about. Are we talking about things that have to be done in the next year or two or are we talking about things that can be planned to evolve over a decade?

MR. JOSEPHSON: I doubt if crisis is an appropriate word. I think the Peace Corps is a mature enough bureaucracy so that it should not be fazed by the fact that only 43,000 people applied this year instead of 45,000. That really is not a crisis. Nor would it be a crisis if the Peace Corps found, let's say, next year, that it had half the number of qualified applicants that it expected. The Peace Corps, in sending that half overseas, can still serve a very valuable purpose. I would have no problem going up to the Hill and saying the Peace Corps was valuable notwithstanding that, given a choice between lowering standards and cutting back, we cut back. That would be responsible action, and the Peace Corps would still be an important program. On the other hand, I am committed to substantial growth in the Peace Corps. I think what it does overseas is needed and is important, and it would be too bad for the U. S. and the world if the situation I just hypothesized happened.

JULES PAGANO: There is a sense of crisis for that part of the Peace Corps that sees itself as educational. If it's going to be an important, enriching one in the total picture, then we've got to move fast or we are a minor operation. We're at the stage where a jump can take place and we can become a major force in education. I agree that if one measures the Peace Corps' impact only in terms of the programs overseas one has fulfilled only a small part of the mandate. The mutual education function has not yet been carried out effectively. Each year that goes by without full realization of the Peace Corps' educational potential is a year lost.

Now this discussion has to be put in the context of other discussions on the role of the universities in international education. The Peace Corps should throw its components into the broader struggle going on to bring a non-Western and a different kind of international dimension into higher education. The Agency for International Development, if you will excuse the expression, is thinking in a dynamic and forward direction with university people at the present time, both in terms of the training of people for overseas service, and in terms of the development of research, some of it more basic than the foundations are willing to support. The impact of this thinking on some universities and on higher education generally over the years is going to be quite significant. Bringing the Peace Corps' effort in line with AID's effort, or at least supplementing it, is something that ought to be thought through carefully. Moreover, the foundations have been trying for years to get more motion in international directions at the universities. The National Defense Education Act, with its creation of area and language study centers, is beginning to have an impact. That program has been expanded. There have been at least three major studies in the last four years all relating to the college and university and their role in world affairs. So there is a lot stewing in this area. The Peace Corps has a contribution which ought to be placed in line with these others. It's a contribution that none of the others can make because it affects students directly.

DONOVAN McCLURE: Since my job is recruitment, I tend to go along with Harris' view of crisis. Bill just has to face Congress. I have to face Shriver. I think our problem on the campus is that we are not getting the best students. We have found in talking to faculty liaisons and others that unless it is fully established that the universities consider this important to the student and to the university, we will not get the top students. I don't think that key faculty members presently recommend Peace Corps service to their students. They direct them into graduate school instead. I don't know whether it is a degree program we need or whether it's just some indication on the part of the power represented here that Peace Corps service is considered important to the individual.

MR. SEELEY: This discussion is too passive for me. The line taken is as though the academic Establishment were given and the Peace Corps were in doubt. It seems to me that the Peace Corps is trembling on the very edge of being a university itself, in militance and in dispersion.

The question it might ask itself is who does it need and what does it need, and I don't think it's all that much, to make itself into a university. If it is going ahead boldly with this, then the question is how the academic Establishment comes around, which institutions decide that they cannot face themselves without being involved with it. But we have been putting it the other way: "How can we sell an idea to the stickiest part of the academic Establishment?" The notion of immediacy is connected with this. Almost nothing except self-accreditation stands in the way of the Peace Corps making itself into such a university now.

DR. DUHL: There are several conversations going on, one of which refers to how to improve the Peace Corps. On one level the Peace Corps is a university and it has to enlarge its concerns, not only in cognitive development of the individuals in the Peace Corps, but in the para-cognitive areas. Another conversation has to do with how to change the university and how to use the Peace Corps as an instrumentality in changing some of the universities. This is a back-and-forth interrelated phenomenon.

Up to now we had been talking about the Peace Corps being primarily related to the academic side of the university. But really the whole para-academic concerns of universities have been increasing tremendously. Joe Kauffman's report to the American Council on Education points out the great increase of budget and concern going into all kinds of para-academic areas;

for example, the development of counseling programs. We have an interesting President here. She's President of a university where she has no direct responsibility with the academic world and is concerned with all the para-academic areas, the living experience and total environment which educates. That's Radcliffe. What we should be concerned with is how you tie the Peace Corps up not just with the academic but with the para-academic development in the universities.

One way to do this is in the whole question of community responsibility. As you begin to get concerned with the community whether it be in civil rights, the War on Poverty or overseas service, you have the opportunity to make changes in both areas. You can start changing the sociology taught in the academic world. You can start changing some of the concepts of human development. Maybe you can start changing some of the concepts of how people conceptualize many of the academic issues, the critical professional issues, and define them in a different way. At the same time through the avenue of service in the community, you have the opportunity to deal with all the other aspects of development of the person. The Peace Corps is one instrumentality for this. There are going to be many others opening, but it happens that the Peace Corps is way ahead.

Now I'd like to throw it back to Polly Bunting and say: "You have a college that is primarily concerned with the para-academic area, and you have the opportunity there to do almost anything inside the university to change the environment for learning, but you also have the opportunity to extend the student out into the world outside. We don't even touch credit there because there is no credit for para-academic activities. The question then is what kind of world could you create for the students at Radcliffe, both inside and outside, which will maximize their development, and how could you see a tie between that activity and the Peace Corps as one instrumentality? Ultimately, how do you create a tie between that and the poverty program and many others?"

MRS. BUNTING: I have been asking myself this question. I'm not sure I have a specific response at this point. I did worry earlier about the thought that every youngster has to have the Peace Corps experience as part of development. I think there are many other ways of getting what the essentials are. There are some people for whom it might not even be needed or useful. One can say things are very valuable without making them requirements for everybody.

DR. SNYDER: Part of our problem is logistical. As higher education and our culture get more concerned with special competences or amassing credits, and as we get a larger number of late adolescents going on to higher education, one of the questions is: Does this really diminish the opportunities that late adolescents have for the kind of experience we've been talking about--the heart informing the hand and the hand informing the heart? In the past there were a number of informal ways in which this was handled. In New England, a hundred years ago, one went to sea for two years and then wrote about it. There are still a great many opportunities, but I think that the number and range of opportunities for relevant activity for late adolescents in this country now are diminished.

One of our crucial problems is providing opportunity for late adolescents to make choices--to think and act and feel in ways that ordinarily they are not free to do in an academic setting. The Peace Corps focuses the problem and provides one set of opportunities.

SISTER JACQUELINE: The pit we could fall into is agreeing on one program. It would be deadly to education and deadly for the Peace Corps if we came up with just one Peace Corps program, whether the 3-2-1 B.A. plan or some other. For the first time since I've known him, I disagree with Jack Seeley. At this point, I would be very much against the Peace Corps being a self-accredited institution because I think it would then lose its infection force for higher education. We want many more loose kinds of experiences in Len Duhl's concept of "the educating society," where we can do what Father Hesburgh was talking about, what his dean does, accrediting after the fact. Some good anthropologist might recognize and help structure the experience before the fact. He might help Roger to synthesize his experience.

We've got something going--I'm not sure how good it is yet--in which students are allowed to apply for a sabbatical semester. First of all we are not requiring it and I don't want to require it across the board (then we're going to have to pretend they're all good and accept them all). At this point we're saying: "It is possible in the social sciences to come in with a proposal." The student has to write the proposal, conceive what she'd like to do for a semester, and show how this organically fits into her degree program. Then it goes through a board in the social sciences, and they allocate this tentatively with X credits, usually between 10 and 15, which comes close to a semester. But that's tentative. It gets rated at the end. There is a mentor who works with her. We had some kids at a mental hospital in New Hampshire, three social science and three art students, working with seemingly hopeless patients.

Maybe one student of mine will write a sabbatical proposal for a two-year experience in the Peace Corps, and we may recognize the experience. Maybe this is all I can do. But I would argue that it's multiplicity that will save us from the new rigor mortis. I really believe in statistical breakthrough. If you turn the Peace Corps into some kind of new institution, then defend us from it. I've seen too much of bureaucracy already, including the new dynamic line of bureaucracy. I don't want it involved in that either.

DR. CARP: How would academia feel if as part of the Peace Corps' recruiting and advertising program we suggested that there were possibilities to get academic credit but it's up to students to put pressure on their own institutions to work this out with them?

DR. DIXON: I'm not sure, Jack, that I understand what you mean by self-accreditation.

MR. SEELEY: I don't think I'm in substantial disagreement with Sister Jacqueline. If the academic Establishment is recalcitrant, you could squeeze by it. A university is not just that which holds certain charters. A university is that which does the best job of higher education. If the Peace Corps is ready to combine the securing and integration of knowledge with the acting in favor of the good, then my suggestion is that the Peace Corps itself is on the very verge of becoming a university which the already accredited bodies will have to recognize.

In a sense this is an exaggeration, but I was trying to say, as the kids say at Berkeley and other campuses, don't get hung up on whether or not Fordham or Chicago or Harvard or any institution will or will not act fast enough. If they won't recognize what is happening, so much the worse for them. Be bold, think of your own strength, think of the fact that what is a university will get accreditation as a university. If you are good enough, if you are doing the job, then self-accreditation can come first and accreditation and recognition by others later. And this is only in the unlikely event that the whole of academia proves as recalcitrant as occasional parts of it are going to be.

DR. JOHNSON: It is deluding the Peace Corps to suggest that it can pass by, sweep by the academic world in this way. Even to state it puts obstacles in the way of the kind of relationship that has to exist. Surely the Peace Corps is not going to be a university in the accepted sense. It partakes of some of the aspects of the university: the service aspects, the functional aspects, the practical aspects, but it is not all of it and I don't think it can possibly be all of it.

MR. WOFFORD: I can see what Jack Seeley means in some areas. For instance, the Peace Corps is now requiring that all Volunteers take a language test in the language of the area they are in at the end of their service. If Peace Corps does this well, in a sense this is accrediting. The Volunteers would have a certificate from the Peace Corps that they've reached a certain level in language. It would be some measurement you were asking for earlier that universities could understand and probably accept.

DR. JOHNSON: This sets up in terms that imply a competitive relationship, and I don't think the Peace Corps wants to or can compete successfully in those terms. There's a mutuality of interest here which has to be worked out, but Peace Corps experience is surely not a substitute for full-fledged university experience. If the Peace Corps can do this it will be the first government agency that's succeeded in this kind of enterprise.

MR. MICHAEL: Look, the Peace Corps itself was a social invention. It swept by HEW, State, AID and any number of other organizations in order to accomplish a job that couldn't be done within the Establishment. We also know that community colleges are growing up at an enormous rate and that state universities are extending their geographic facilities and auspicies all over the place. I don't see any reason on the face of it why one couldn't establish a new university, partly with government funds just the way many universities are presently operating substantially on government funds along with foundation support. Recruit the kind of students who want to go to that kind of university and pirate faculty away from the universities the way universities pirate faculty now. Set up a university that has as its purpose the kind of thing Len Duhl and Ben Snyder were emphasizing, the large-scale service and the para-cognitive activity. And that's why you would go to that kind of university, the way you go to MIT or Berkeley if you intend to be a certain kind of engineer. Don't think of this as a government activity, nor as just another university but as an institute of technology (using technology in a different sense) and recruit just what you want for it, and operate it. If there is anything to the assumption that there is around the land a student body interested in working with dying leukemia youngsters or going to Turkey or anything else, and if there's also faculty in the land with that kind of aspirations, you might well be able to bring them together.

SPEAKER: What happens to the notion that the university is a community of scholars?

MR. MICHAEL: It is a community of scholars. There would have to be a great deal of basic research going on in this area of human development.

SPEAKER: Then what happens to the Peace Corps idea?

MR. MICHAEL: The kind of activity the Peace Corps presently undertakes would be one of the major forms of activity undertaken in such a university. I would think one of its major functions would be inventing new social helping activities, and the means for organizing them and accomplishing them around the world.

SISTER JACQUELINE: Are you suggesting that one such university devoting itself to this would encourage the infection of all other institutions?

MR. MICHAEL: Just the way MIT set the standard for engineering around this country.

SISTER JACQUELINE: But MIT didn't infect the rest fast enough. Look at what I am sure you all would call third or fifth rate colleges, where you have got most of your so-called humanistic studies students looking at science and technology as that utilitarian, pragmatic thing we have to put up with in our world, and not at all as an intellectual, humanizing kind of discipline. It missed somehow. The rest of us didn't get in.

MR. MICHAEL: Fair enough. It did infect quite a number of the universities and Johns Hopkins infected medical education. It didn't get to all of them and the rate of infection, of course, varies. This leads back to the question of how much time there is. But my own feeling is that you have a better chance of getting the results you want and of building up the kind of capability by starting with a center of infection and then hoping for the spread and encouraging the spread rather than depending on the kind of slow process of change in the standard academic environment and the standard youth environment where the rate of contagion is likely to be slow.

One might add that the fastest way to get social change is in crisis and conflict. I would imagine that a university which is able to pirate top students and top faculty away because this was a major area of interest and meaning to them, would do more toward straightening out and sharpening up other universities and getting them into this area than hoping for gradual institutional change.

SISTER JACQUELINE: In another context, a lot of our nuns have been saying that from everything you know in the history of an institution that you can never really remake an institution from the inside of the old, that you have to start a new institution. It's a crucial question. Some of us are saying that in the 20th century we've got enough information to look at the whole notion of the pilot study, the model, within an institution. It's the R and D concept that modern industry and all the others have arrived at. At least maybe there is the potential to do what hasn't been done before: you may be able to make your microcosm within some existing institutions. We aren't ruling against yours, but let's get this going inside the Establishment, too.

MR. RIESMAN: I would like to see all this become part of the national culture so that a year or two of service becomes a part of the consecutive career life for all successful or proto-successful people. At the same time, we will have to recognize that people's motives are mixed and it's all right not to be totally dedicated. I only believe in the celibate saints. I haven't met many; I've met some. It's all right to want the credit and the reward and the experience and not to be totally committed to something -- not even to have to sort out all one's motives. I feel that one of the Peace Corps' problems with recruitment is that the person thinks of himself as not that pure and feels put off. The faculty members see the commitment sort of activity as purely emotional and may be put off unduly, not recognizing the extent to which the Peace Corps creates academic and intellectual interests rather than dissipates them. Let's also, in working with Peace Corps and Peace Corps-like people, help them understand our own society better. But we don't do that by suggesting that organization is bad, that bureaucracy is bad, that cunning is bad, that wanting credit is bad and that we are immoral if we are not wholly individualistic, wholly solopsistic.

The curious thing about the Peace Corps is that it's a solidary activity of anarchists. They fear solidary activity and they fear the university. I've been sitting here thinking how sad it is that these young men, Mr. Fox and Mr. Landrum, are not in a university. I'd like them to have PhD's. I don't care what they do after that. I'd like them to at least have that option. I'm glad I was able to help persuade David Szanton to stay in the university, and I hope he does stay and get a PhD. I don't care what he does after that. I want him to have that license and that choice.

I think that the danger of setting up a Peace Corps university is that it would not draw any but the few that are already committed and it might seal them off from being infectious with the rest. It may be that in despair we come to that. I'd much rather see a more open-handed feeling that you don't have to be fully dedicated, you don't have to be brave enough to start a new institution -- that it's all right to go to a prestigeful one.

DAVID SZANTON: Let me add something to that -- I'm working with a group of Volunteers now at St. John's College training to go to India. Certainly to them -- and it was true of ourselves as well when we were in the Philippines -- they don't view the Peace Corps as an educational institution. We do now because of our experience as returned Volunteers. But the people who are applying now don't see the Peace Corps as an educational institution. They see it in terms of going over to help. Yesterday, when an economist came through and said, "Poultry probably isn't a very useful thing in India," the bottom dropped out for a lot of people because it is a poultry project.

The only way you are going to get Volunteers to come into this as an educational institution is if the whole image of the Peace Corps changes. This may cause more conflict within Peace Corps than the Peace Corps is willing to put up with. I don't know very much about the internal workings that go on here in Washington, but certainly out in the field, you get the impression that Peace Corps/Washington thinks of itself primarily, and projects itself primarily, as doing good, helping the poor natives in these various countries.

MR. WOFFORD: What do the Volunteers see themselves doing? I heard another story making a different point about this same group. They were arguing about what they were there for and they all seemed so self-motivated in terms of career and experience that one Volunteer said he came in because he wanted to serve people. In a few days, he left the program because he was so upset by the motives he discovered in most of his colleagues.

MR. SZANTON: I think you're misinterpreting the situation. The Volunteers are Americans, and they are inevitably concerned with increasing productivity. This is what they think they're going to be doing in the Peace Corps. As they go through the experience, they become more and more aware that increasing productivity is not the only goal that they might have. But it takes a long time before they begin to think about it. There was even a kind of resentment against some of us who took a more analytical point of view. Somehow this wasn't quite cricket -- this wasn't true Peace Corps spirit . You shouldn't go off and do a study of something. I wonder what the other Volunteers thought of the fellow who spent his time studying the market. I suspect that most of the Volunteers in Ethiopia felt that somehow he was shirking his job. The feeling is that you should be in there teaching all the time. This is the original mentality which the Peace Corps fosters, I'm afraid.

SPEAKER: I'm not afraid--I'm for it!

MR. SZANTON: But you may not be able to mix that with the educational function.

MR. SEELEY: I don't think it's a question of which of these things you are doing. It's largely a question of by-products. At least the kids I've been talking to in Berkeley would have regarded it as something like the highest heresy if you said that they ought to be in the FSM or out of the FSM *because* they would or wouldn't learn something, or *because* they would or wouldn't serve, or *because* they were or were not altruistic. You got into the FSM, if you did, because your whole nature told you this was the next thing to do, the sensible thing to do at this moment in history. Then afterwards, in the right company, you might be willing to admit that you never learned more about the world and yourself--or even philosophy in the case of a philosophy major whose name I won't mention. They don't want to up-end it. That is, you do not do these things *for the sake of* salvation, you do not pursue happiness; you do what is right. And, in fact, I think, among them it is almost a new way of sensing what is right. And you don't even use that vocabulary if you can avoid it. You do what comes to hand. You do what is cool, which is what is appropriate for the day. But out of this comes, in a barely disguised sense, point for point what could otherwise be put in a religious or educational or very high-minded vocabulary. I don't think we should be taken in by the difference in vocabulary.

MR. BERLEW: I am always at least two conversations behind. There were two points I wanted to make. First, it's been my observation in the Peace Corps, particularly as a result of my work in Pakistan that there is something that the academic world can bring to the Peace Corps that it hasn't brought yet. I would describe it as a certain amount of form or discipline that the Peace Corps staff is not equipped or numerous enough to provide, even to think about providing for the most part. I found that those few Volunteers who because of their own personal capacity or characteristics not only did the job but stood back and looked at what they were doing and tried to analyze it and put it into some kind of a framework, who on their own initiative wrote a paper about their particular work as related to something broader, were better Volunteers.

The problem is not so much lack of time, the time is there, it is using it in the best possible way. I think academic discipline can be very useful in this respect. We demanded and insisted and finally obtained monthly reports from our Volunteers in Pakistan. This forced each

Volunteer to sit back once a month and look at what he was doing, try to put it into some kind of a context, write it down, and send it in to us. We let them know that we read it and we commented on it. That's the extent of the academic discipline and education we were able to provide. We ought to be able to do a lot more than that.

Second, we have been doing a fair amount of thinking about the ideas Don Michael was talking about, a Peace Corps university or a separate university, a new university. We've even gone so far as writing draft memorandums. We see it not as an alternative to what the university should do, or to what we can do in the Peace Corps overseas, but as something that ought to be done anyhow. We have related it to the field of economic and social development in the international area because that is probably the area where the greatest opportunity exists today, and it is most closely related to what the Peace Corps is all about, where the Peace Corps experience could make a real input in training programs and in the experience of people who might come back to this university and obtain a graduate degree.

Our thinking has been that other government agencies involved in development work should participate in it, and that it should involve other universities. It shouldn't be Peace Corps-run, but some of the Peace Corps' principles we hope would predominate. We would hope that one of the underlying themes of the whole university would be communication. No matter how good our ideas are in economics or technical areas, we've got to be able to communicate with the people we are working with. This is something the Peace Corps is pretty good at, and this should underlie whatever field of study a person might be engaged in.

Another possibility might be that it should be an international university. It shouldn't be dominated by Americans. It should involve both professors and students from a large number of countries. I would be very interested in your reactions to such an idea and the possible participation of universities.

MR. RIESMAN: If Mr. Berlew is talking about a school located hopefully on a major campus of a major university center, I think this would be great. That would answer all my fears about the problems of launching a totally new enterprise, and all my hopes about what one could do within given ones, which I share with Sister Jacqueline.

MR. BERLEW: We haven't thought this through. We are thinking of a university which would be compatible with the interests of other universities -- whether it is called a school related to one particular university or whether it's called a university related to a consortium of other universities.

MR. EURICH: Would there be some advantage in thinking of an organization comparable to the Armed Services Institute which was started at the University of Wisconsin during the war for the men in the armed services? Then there would be some central point where you direct the educational work of Peace Corps people out in the field, give them examinations, assess the experience from the standpoint of its academic values, and in other ways tie in with colleges and universities.

RALPH SMUCKLER: What are we talking about, a Peace Corps university? I find it difficult to understand the concept. If we are talking about the Armed Forces Institute or if we're talking about an institute or a center attached to an existing university, this is one thing. If we're talking about a separate educational institution or an agency that will perform for the Peace Corps functions which are performed by the university -- the function of basic fundamental research, for instance, the responsibility of scholars to move the frontiers of learning ahead -- that seems to me a really gross distortion of what I think the Peace Corps really is.

MR. BERLEW: We're not talking about a Peace Corps university but about an international development university which would involve a lot of parties. The basis for thinking it would be useful is that in the area of international development there is no institution today, no university which brings together and relates well to the type of work that AID and the Peace Corps and other organizations are engaged in.

In the Peace Corps we have a growing need to teach and to train people before they go over, and we have a growing need for research. I'm just talking about the Peace Corps part of this. Our problem is that the Peace Corps as presently organized is not capable of doing enough of these things in the educational field. So a vacuum exists.

MR. SMUCKLER: I question this. What evidence do you have that these vacuums exist, with respect to research in social development internationally? Are the universities not providing individuals, or could they not provide individuals along the line just mentioned, to provide discipline and form for the overseas work of Volunteers. I think that once the door was open slightly you'd find a lot who would walk through it. If the door were opened a little better, you would have universities all over this country working in these areas just as they have on training the Peace Corps Volunteers.

MR. LANDRUM: Let me give a concrete, if very narrow, example in terms of my own situation. From teaching two years at the University of Nigeria I developed a great interest in African literature and now cannot find a satisfactory university vehicle for cultivating this.

MR. SMUCKLER: At the University of Indiana the folklore program is sending two people next year to Nigeria to do just this study in the field of folklore in Nigeria. If you explore far enough in this country you find a range of activities within the university that permits the kind of study you are referring to.

MR. SEELEY: I feel responsible for getting us where we are. All I meant was that we should not forget that if the Establishment is so intractable or will not yield or will not develop or will not face the point in history in which we find ourselves, then the Peace Corps ought not to forget its potentiality to convert itself into a university with the aid of individuals and probably existing organizations. But it seems obvious that the determination of what is best to do is an empirical matter which requires exploration and negotiation which we can't do at this table. We have to find out what universities are willing to do by way of drawing up new schools, by the way of changing their total program, of introducing special degrees or whatever they will, and only then think of a new institution to do those things the old institutions will not do.

SISTER JACQUELINE: If you take the basic thesis of the Peace Corps, which was to go into nations to take existing situations and work within the parameter of the existing institutions to bring about change, there is a fantastic irony involved in trying to build your own little oasis which is cut off. It's a cheap way out.

MR. BERLEW: That isn't an accurate description of what I was attempting to say.

SISTER JACQUELINE: Then I heard you wrong. And I hope you won't approach this as Mr. Riesman put it to you. He says he can't imagine anything harder than the series of negotiations that would get this kind of institute onto the campus of Harvard or Michigan or Princeton or wherever it might be. It might be fun.

MR. BERLEW: What I had intended to say, in response to Mr. Riesman's question, was that in the first place it must have the support of the universities. They must be fully involved. It either should be in a university as a school or separate institute or a separate institution which is set up by a consortium of universities and other agencies, including the Peace Corps.

DR. DIXON: It seems to me that we have not solved the operational questions but raised others. Let me suggest that by programs or by institutional inventions we begin to do some of these things with the universities. Let's take a narrow field -- a system of correspondence courses and examinations which the university world accepts for credits. That's just one area.

But your point is that if the Peace Corps treats itself as an educational institution and invents programs and institutes this is far from what the academic world needs in order for its door to be open. It needs things that it can connect with in the Peace Corps. This kind of an institute attached to the right academic body might be the way to open this door to relationships with all the major universities and colleges.

For the Peace Corps to behave like an educational institution means exercising your autonomy. Not going to the Establishment and saying "what can you do?" but deciding on the range of alternatives -- on the things within your autonomy that are necessary, but starting with proposals for cooperation.

SPEAKER: One of the great problems is just plain old communications. Unless things have changed, what the Peace Corps Volunteer has at the end of his service to present to any institution for evaluation is a diploma that states he has successfully fulfilled two years of service in a particular country. One of the problems is how you establish a stream of communication about the Peace Corps experience which is extremely different from individual to individual and country to country -- how you get this experience transmitted to educational institutions in such a way that the educational value can be assessed. We talked a good deal about how to change the educational Establishment. Maybe one direction to go is to change the Peace Corps and its practices.

DR. DIXON: It would be helpful to me if we could hear something more from the Peace Corps as to what it is you're looking for from academia.

WARREN WIGGINS: About the only way to present my own view is to try to outline both the Peace Corps and the universities, and with apologies I'll try to do that. It's much easier for me with the Peace Corps. You start with the three often repeated formal objectives: one, a job abroad to be done by trained manpower; two, education of American Volunteers in an on-and-off-the-job situation; and three, the on-and-off-the-job education of other people who are observing or participating with us -- the host country nationals. Those three things are why we are in business. That's what the law says.

Then you move to another level and the Peace Corps is a lot more than what the law says. It is a group of people, most of whom have a notion of wanting to revolutionize overseas societies. They want to do more than provide skilled manpower and increase understanding. There is a drive to change societies. Secondly, we want to change the United States. We are a militant outfit, whether we are Peace Corps staff or returned Volunteers. And, thirdly, we want to change ourselves. Even though it is not in the law, we desire to have an experience by which the Peace Corps Volunteer changes personally.

That transition, in terms of this discussion, has two parts. To some extent it is an academic transition that fits into credit hours. It's also a transition in Father Hesburgh's "full individual" sense -- to a participant in society. In that transition, I think the first part, the academic attainment measurable by hormal academic standards is very small. The second part is very large.

Moving to another level of the Peace Corps, we talk about it as an institution that prides itself in having the capacity for change and growth and evolution from what it is to what it might be. That's a central thread of philosophical content of the leaders of the group. The Peace Corps was born in change and expects to continue to change. It is an open society and is very proud of being an open society. It does aspire to have excellence in learning. It wants to retain a non-rigid structure. It even dares to be a leader of other institutions. We haven't done much of that yet; this pride is reserved for the future. But, nonetheless, the Peace Corps is led by people who conceive of the Peace Corps experiment as setting a standard and leading the way for other institutions, both in and out of government.

These are central characteristics of the Peace Corps. If you take these different levels, the formal legislative job; the change in society desired at home and abroad; the change in the individual, academic a little bit, personal a lot; and then the institutional scope of what we're trying to create in a non-institution institution, and you look at us today with 13, 000 individuals in training and overseas, it is one thing to see the experiment as it is now. It's quite another thing to think what it may be as an experiment three or five or ten years from now if it is of a different size, if it picks up steam and emotion and involvement in the characteristics that it now prides itself on but hasn't fully developed.

And so the crisis (I'm inclined to think there is a critical point in the next two years, whether you call it a crisis or not) is this: If in the next two years this institution that prides itself on change and growth and being an open society, doesn't evolve, then it will see itself and be seen by others without this ability to change. If we do not grow and we do not change within the next years, if we are essentially the same in two years as we are now, we will be different then from what we are now, because we will have lost the characteristic of change. If there is, then, a crisis in the Peace Corps, it is that if we don't change and grow, we will in fact change and regress. We may be a good thing to do at the ten thousand level, but we won't effect the revolution of other societies or the revolution of our own society in anything like our potential.

Now to the other side. Universities seem to have three main characteristics. The easiest observable one is the provision of an academic transition for people who enter as freshmen, graduate as seniors. The universities have plenty of system on that side of the ladder. The second is the personal transition towards the full individual, or whatever you want to call him, to which universities are devoting large resources but by and large have not developed large systems. I suspect that 30 or 40 per cent of the student body may go through the university without full non-academic involvement in terms of personal growth. There is just no comparison as far as I am aware between the half of the university devoted to the non-academic and the half of the university devoted to the academic, in terms of the systematic involvement of every individual. The third aspect of the university is the phrase: "How to understand and remake the world." Put these three things together, the academic transition, the personal transition, and the whole growth and spread of ideas and I think you encompass in one framework the university.

How does the university with those three parts relate to the Peace Corps, either as it is now or as it could be five years from now and maybe five times its size? For the universities, the first thing is to understand and participate and guide and research this crazy experiment. This relates to the third characteristic of the university, the growth and spread of ideas, or how to understand and remake the world. The Peace Corps is an outfit that's trying to do this in a rather unique way. That ought to be the first bridge between the university and the Peace Corps. There isn't much of a bridge there now, in my personal opinion.

The second bridge is on the academic side. I think that's the smallest bridge, the relating of academic achievement or something that produces an A. B. or an M. A. or semester credits. I don't think that much of the Peace Corps really gets into that scheme as presently defined by the institutions represented here.

But what does really connect is the second characteristic of the university, what happens to an individual in his maturation and growth as a person. And that's where universities don't have the scheme and can't award the honor; they don't have the degree for this. How do you tell when a person's well-rounded? Do you give him a star? That's the relationship that is the vital one, I think. And that's why Radcliffe especially ought to be interested in the Peace Corps, because what we do mainly is in the non-academic side; a little area study, a lot of language, not a great deal else that is academic.

From the Peace Corps' point of view, the biggest thing we need is for the university and its faculty to be excited about the Peace Corps -- in its institutional aspects as well as in what can be done in overseas societies and in changing our own. That's what we would like. Whether we deserve and merit it is another question, but if you ask us what we need, that kind of excitement on your part would enable us to move to where we might be five years from now in terms of size and effective participation. It's an entirely different sort of experiment if we become five times as large as we are now. I would call that our primary need.

I don't know whether you can help us abroad, or in preparation, or on return, in terms of the personal transition, the non-academic transition of the Volunteers. If you can, this would be of enormous benefit to us.

Insofar as it makes sense to move in accrediting Peace Corps experience with semester hours, this may be somewhat valuable, but to my mind this is the least interesting part of the university-Peace Corps relationship. The broadest bridge we have together is thinking about what has happened in the Peace Corps in four and a half years and then together asking the question, "Is this an experiment that ought to be tried in other places?" or "What are the lessons of this experiment that apply elsewhere?" and "Ought the university to be advocating that as a part of full citizenship a normal individual should expect to have served two years--not necessarily in the Peace Corps but in something like the Peace Corps?"

I hope that out of Peace Corps experience and out of universities that want to understand and remake the world, we have a common set of experience that ought to lead to universalizing the Peace Corps role that has involved more than 15,000 people -- universalizing it on your campus for everybody. If people like you really established the standard that today's citizen not only gets his A.B. but he also needs to plan two years of service and participation and learning from experience, this would be the biggest contribution, not just to the Peace Corps, but to America.

****** LUNCH ******

DR. DIXON: Warren Wiggins set out in terms which are educationally understandable the educational objectives of the Peace Corps as he sees them. Recognizing the fact that there is probably disagreement with Warren's statement, is that so great that we would only add to the confusion if we were to take his statement at this point and work as a group on its possibilities for implementation?

MR. BERLEW: I don't disagree with it. There might be a greater undercurrent of disagreement within the agency -- to the extent that anybody's thought about.

MR. WOFFORD: Some of us would like that statement to get to the whole Peace Corps as something which would help shape the Peace Corps.

MR. RIESMAN: I'd like to get it outside the Peace Corps too, to the universities.

DR. DUHL: I think there's a lot less disagreement within the Peace Corps than most people think about what Warren talked about and what we've been talking about.

MR. BERLEW: There is a very substantial and influential body in the Peace Corps that really has never thought in these terms at all, and therefore they will resist a lot of what we're talking about until they're informed. Then they'll see it.

MR. RIESMAN: If we think just of the Volunteer's two year period in this dispersed university, how could this be made more fruitful intellectually? What could be done to make the whole experience in the beginning more intensely reflective without damaging it?

I think of my one experience with the termination of service conference in Colombia. I wonder what sorts of opportunities there might be for attaching roving intellectual ambassadors to the larger Peace Corps places at some point in the trajectory of the Volunteers. Mr. Berlew talked about monthly reports. I wonder how many Peace Corps people could be persuaded to keep diaries .

Mr. Kennedy asked do you want a professor or do you want a coach. I want professors who are coaches. They would be coaches in the sense of saying to somebody, "You know you are better at this than you think. Why are you afraid of doing this? When you go back home what you might do is this." One of my usefulnesses in Bogota was telling people where not to go on with graduate studies. I had a much harder time telling them where to go. I know there is regular Peace Corps staff service but it helps to have somebody out there who sees them in their setting and can talk to them this way.

MR. WOFFORD: Do you think that if it could be done on a much wider scale with professors who are coaches this would move us toward Warren's goal of getting the faculty involved?

SPEAKER: I also think it would significantly affect the professor-coach. This could become a two-way bridge, a very important one, unless someone went and tried to cram the Volunteers' experience into conventional disciplines.

MR. RIESMAN: Although a coach may exploit a student for the glory of his own career as a coach and for the institution, he may also have the advantage of wanting to see the person play better. It is the coach who watches and sees the way the motion is being done wrong or inefficiently, sees if the person is holding back, and talks this out. I go back to my point about the need to give people self-confidence, particularly at the famous schools where it is often impaired.

The other thing about the coach is that often in a human relationship he responds in a way that is more germaine rather than someone looking to grades--than someone looking for an academic disciple in a narrow area or for evidence to grind into a particular scheme.

ERNIE FOX: Would the professor-coach's function as a non-grader be impaired if he were a broker between individual Volunteers who are capable of doing graduate work and universities which have programs suited to their future study?

MR. RIESMAN: A matching rather than grading. And here the academic is less stidky than often appears. Take the small college, even a good place like Reed which is in particular trouble because it doesn't give grades, where one has to worry about getting one's people into the better graduate schools. A good man will just pick up the telephone and call up the department chairman and say, look, we've got a bright fellow here. That's all you need to do.

MR. FOX: I keep wondering if many Volunteers wouldn't find the program they want if they have someone who knows a field well and who is respected in academic circles.

MR. RIESMAN: Or can put him in touch with someone who knows a field well.

MR. FOX: Yes, and who can say something definitive about the Volunteer which will be respected.

DR. DIXON: Coach, broker, surrogate.

DR. DUHL: The coach you're talking about develops a very different relationship to a person than does the ordinary academician. You're talking about someone who relates to the whole person rather than any narrow achievement. That's very rare in any university. He begins to teach not only in his own academic fields but psychological and social fields. The counseling programs in most schools don't fulfill this function at all. In a few places the psychiatrist has been playing this function--being pushed out into a very different role than most psychiatrists originally had been in, into para-psychiatric areas. The psychiatrist has gotten a lot of this by default. The institution should really be building it into its ongoing operation. What you really need is an entirely new brand of people. It's the revolution back to the real teachers we talk about all the time.

DR. CARP: It sounds to me like what we call career counseling and our Career Information Service.

SPEAKER: No!

MR. EURICH: Perhaps you could try an adaptation of the case study method used in law schools and business schools, where the case is actually the experience the person is having,

SPEAKER: As a method, in training?

MR. EURICH: Yes, in training and overseas where you have the coach with the Volunteers.

DR. SNYDER: What I have in mind is certainly not a new kind of career guidance. Let me cite an occasion. Four weeks ago I was on an airplane and the young man sitting next to me turned out to be a former Volunteer who was going out to training for the poverty program in the Far West. We started talking and I learned a great deal. He had been involved in building schools in Ecuador. He talked about the sense of disappointment he went through. This was a kid from the Corn Belt who had gone to a good state university and then had gone out there to build schools and he felt that he had been quite unprepared. He didn't think anybody could have prepared him for the shock that he had felt in coming to terms with people in a way he had never had to do before. He described the various formal efforts that had been made to prepare him to understand before he went and his own feeling about how inadequate these were. And he was, I thought, very honest about saying that this reflected on him as much as on what they had tried to do.

But there was an informal contact that was apparently crucial for him that came about with a fairly high but not top-level Foreign Service Officer who went around checking on what was going on. He was feeling fairly disappointed after six months out, when they spent an afternoon talking; then about a year later an afternoon talking again. And these were for him the two experiences that enabled him to get some perspective. Now, I don't have the facts and I don't know whether this account is true, but here is someone who at least, in viewing this experience, asked some questions about what he was really involved in that made him look at it as something much more important than the business of building a school and made him assess his own development. And he didn't want to be, he used this term, a Boy Scout out in the woods building schools. I had this kind of experience in mind. That is very different, it seems to me, than what is ordinarily thought of as a guidance counselor.

DR. DIXON: It is clear that this kind of teacher exists. Would this kind of person be useful within the Peace Corps?

MR. SZANTON: In a sense I was doing just this in the Philippines. After having been a regular Volunteer for nine months I was asked by the project director to cover two islands which were overseen by a Peace Corps staff man who was completely involved in administrative details. I spent the next months traveling and seeing 85 Volunteers scattered around those two islands, spending a day per Volunteer in his household. I'm not a professor, not a career counselor. But I did not find it difficult talking with him about what he was doing and telling him about what other people were doing--precisely what you're talking about. It did a lot of good. One specific example I remember. A number of Volunteers were struck by a Filipino concept which translates as shame and which is a major mechanism of Filipino society. People, especially school kids, get hung up on this, what it's shameful to do and what it is not. I asked one of the Volunteers to write up his notions. I took them to one of the normal schools and showed it to Filipino educational psychologists. They got excited about it. I talked with some other Volunteers about the same thing. One wrote a paper to counter the other. We ended up with a conference which lasted three days at one of the schools, about guilt and shame as a mechanism for influencing social behavior. Since then at least two papers have been written at the University of Chicago on the subject. Another at Columbia. Two articles have come out in Filipino sociological journals on this, written by Filipinos who are researching this now.

I think there are people who can do this within the Peace Corps, and it doesn't necessarily take an expert to stimulate it.

DR. DUHL: There are, through serendipitous happenings, a lot of things occurring. People who come out of Washington can stimulate them. Some, not all. People within the Peace Corps can do it. Some, not all. Occasionally you get a really good end-of-service conference. We are talking about institutionalizing this so that it happens not just at the end but goes on all the way through, on an individualized basis too. We should be constantly using what we have got and creating more and finally building it into the system. Then you've got an institution in the educating society I'm talking about.

MR. BERLEW: Ideally, the Peace Corps staff people should do this as a normal part of their function. But they are limited, as I see it, by three things. First, their individual capacities. Second, the amount of time they have--the staffing pattern we have. Third, the recognition of this as an important part of their regular function. In the latter case we ought to be able to provide something. We've articulated a lot of concrete things here. But in terms of focusing on this we haven't done that, particularly in orienting overseas staff.

MR. SEELEY: I've been trying to pull this together. I gather this termination conference idea has been immensely successful both for the leader and the Volunteers and the Peace Corps. And the model is clear. But in addition to this you Volunteers feel that you would have profited from a backing up in depth which should have led back into the university, and there to people who know particular fields so that when you needed refined details which the field people could not provide you had a chain all the way back and the flow was natural both ways. This fits very closely with Dave's idea of the coach. But this is too complicated to think of as a one-layer thing. So not just professors are involved and not just professor-coaches but coaches who are in the organization who are in turn related to professor-coaches who are related to someone whose speciality this is. In this outline it isn't too clear where the university ends and the Peace Corps begins, and vice versa.

SISTER JACQUELINE: What would be the chance for some kind of sabbatical for people in universities -- perhaps in the social sciences -- playing a role similar to the one Dave played? Partly for the purpose of re-infecting the university community from experience.

MR. DIXON: Suppose their function were reasonably defined, then the Peace Corps made a call for these kinds of people, and one of the places they called upon were existing educational institutions. Would the present behavior of the institutions need to be modified to meet this demand?

SPEAKER: A sabbatical would be one approach. But it might be wise if the faculty man could have some contact with the Volunteers in training. Then go overseas for three weeks or a month. Then a year later go to meet the Volunteers again. The total commitment would not be much more than two or three months, rather than a sabbatical.

MR. RIESMAN: Yes, it might be enough if there were two meetings with the same person over the two-year period -- perhaps the third month, roughly a year apart.

MR. FOX: Plus the possibility of correspondence.

SPEAKER: YES. Yet that's different from what Dave Szanton talked about. One can see several different levels. Someone in the field serving, as Dave Szanton was doing, with a much more intimate knowledge, seems very clever, an excellent example of what one should expect, what we were talking about in terms of a coach. You've got two different people.

DR. DUHL: The answer's not going to be just taking faculty from the universities as circuit riders for the Peace Corps. There's a need for the universities to begin to develop people who will perform this function not only in the Peace Corps but in many other places in society. This is the same need I hear about for the slums. These are the same kinds of people who will be valuable helping people move up the ladder to new jobs and activities. This is the future growth of a great number of jobs in the United States. What I'm suggesting is that universities really start preparing for the future, using the Peace Corps to start training people to perform this kind of function, using other places to try it out, and then gradually evolve a more permanent corps in the Peace Corps, the universities, and the community.

MR. REISMAN: I don't quite agree with Len Duhl. That would lead in the line that Dr. Carp was suggesting. When I think of the Peace Corps, I think of the three quarters of the Volunteers coming as graduates of universities and half of them going back. But what I hear said here, and in the last two days of the White House Conference on Education, reinforces my feeling of an intense anti-academicism and anto-intellectualism at loose often in the best people who feel fed up with the red tape of academia. The demand for total congruence of life and thought, rather than some consecutive staging and human compartalization and tolerance for misfitting here, seems to me unrealistic. I wonder to what extent the Peace Corps has drawn people into it who would resent any roving professor who comes poking around and whether the rest of the Peace Corps not represented in this room would feel, "What do we want these stuffy professors around for?" But I really do want both to refresh the academic and to keep the Peace Corps from losing touch with the vicarious.

MR. FOX: What's wrong with a little resentment? Take Len Duhl's premise that the practitioner is changed by his patient.

MR. REISMAN: Quite right.

MR. WOFFORD: DavidReisman could answer his own questions, though, or make Ernie Fox's point by telling about his own experiences. Everyone who read the report and dealt with the Completion of Service Conference considered it of great help. But the Peace Corps Representative asked, "Who's David Reisman?" and didn't even bother to meet Dave. Yet the Volunteers appreciated it.

SISTER JACQUELINE: We got some of the same thing at the Returned Volunteer Conference. You had a tremendous amount of sympathy with the Volunteers and their impatience with the status quo here. But there was among many of them you talked to in the halls what I think is a kind of cheap escape from reality, for coming to grips with the terms of reality. Literature is full of critics who could not make it as playwrights. We've got to fight in ourselves and other people so that we don't settle for a removal from society or for the dilettante critic's role.

MRS. BUNTING: This is one of the most useful things--to hear about something that is a real contribution to the Peace Corps program. We need a lot more study of, and reporting back of, examples of the person who works or the things that work for the Volunteer. In my own graduate work in nutrition, the way that we found the vitamins that everybody needs was by taking rats and trying to see what we could do to grow rats as well as we could. And then you found one or two vitamins that worked. So I hope we look hard at this--in terms of the satisfaction of the person in the field and the work that person ought to be doing.

MR. SZANTON: We had to fight the rest of the Peace Corps to do this kind of thing because all around us were the people who were saying, "If you're going to have a conference, it's got to be on how to teach English, or how to teach science." Having our conference on shame and guilt really got a lot of people extremely angry. The Peace Corps was sufficiently decentralized so that we got away with it, but we had to fight a majority of the people in the Peace Corps who do not think this way.

MR. LANDRUM: One of the problems the agency has in documenting experiments that work is that it is so busy with it's day-to-day operations. If there is going to be a spark-catching mechanism, perhaps it has to come from the universities, or a satellite institute to the Peace Corps itself. The Peace Corps cannot document these things as presently operating. There are problems with the law in financing some of it. The reaction I always get to new ideas is to do it in my spare time, outside the mainstream operations and expenditure. And these things, to be good, cost money to nurture, and have to be mainstream.

MR. WOFFORD: Most of the problem is just enormous pressure. The Peace Corps has always moved so fast. Part of its mystique is that the momentum has got to be kept up. I don't think there is a lack of interest in catching the sparks and communicating and reporting things. There's a good audience for anything that is done well and written up well from Shriver to the field. But we don't have an institutional framework yet to do this very well.

MR. MICHAEL: We've been indulging in a very familiar psychological exercise of avoidance. We've been talking about the ramifications of one kind of operational procedure which is interesting and would, no doubt, have its applications in whatever kind of mutual reinforcement of heart and hand one might invent to meet the conditions for the desired relation of the Peace Corps and academia. But it is only a procedure. The real issue is how we implement the conditions we set out. We have to have those conditions met first and then the procedure might work. What we've been doing since lunch, in effect, is working out a table of organization before we've really settled on what kind of functions and requirements that table of organization needs.

DR. DIXON: Would you care to be a little more explicit about what we are avoiding?

MR. MICHAEL: We are avoiding facing up to the issue of whether academia, by and large, or even in very many special cases, can be excited in the way Wiggins suggested. Precisely the kinds of resistances to social invention that we've been talking about make it necessary to have a radical social invention to meet the inspiration and purpose of the Peace Corps. The things to be done to meet these requirements don't fit most of academia.

SPEAKER: What are these?

MR. MICHAEL: Militantism. Political action. Most of the academic environment in this country is concerned with maintaining itself as itself. There are exceptions. Perhaps we should be spending our time talking about how to exploit the exceptions.

My hunch is, from listening to Wiggins and Wofford, that what the Peace Corps is out to do is introduce major social change--not only abroad but at home. My hunch about academia, however, supported by a lot of written and spoken observations, is that for many universities a crucial activity is maintaining the status quo rather than introducing major social changes. The kinds of issues that the Peace Corps represents are not primarily those which most academic institutions and most students are interested in.

DR. DUHL: There are two ways of proceeding. One is to by-pass completely the status quo part of academia and concentrate on experimenting with the remaining parts. The other is to use that time-honored means of introducing social change: scaring the Establishment by setting up a countervailing force--a technical institute devoted to this kind of activity.

MR. JOHNSON: You won't achieve the purposes, however, unless you get the personnel, and you could get the personnel better by working with the academic institutions which have a lot to say about whether you are going to get the personnel.

MR. MICHAEL: You could get them the way most universities have gotten their personnel--by paying them better and by offering them the opportunity to work on problems that are basically more interesting to them. There are enough first-rate faculty in universities in this country who want to do that sort of thing and don't have the opportunity. It's also a matter of getting them together so that they can mutually stimulate one another.

MR. JOHNSON: I have a feeling that the academic institutions, however conservative they are, won't scare very easily.

MR. MICHAEL: Possibly. But many departments have been scared by vigorous recruiting efforts of other universities. Let me make clear though that I am not excluding the desirability of simultaneously working with established institutions which are interested in encouraging social change.

MR. RIESMAN: I simply cannot accept the polarization implied--that the Peace Corps is the agent of social change and the university the agent of the *status quo*. Things are going on on my campus. As I listen to my faculty talk, I don't see this *status quo*. If we're going to pursue this kind of thing I think it will be worthless.

MR. MICHAEL: You would agree, however, that there are many universities that are *status quo* oriented, while the Peace Corps is definitely social change oriented.

MR. RIESMAN: Yes.

MRS. BUNTING: You have a concept in mind which you think ought to have a higher priority in the universities. You can fight for that against all the other kinds of people--against the things they think should have higher priority in use of faculty time.

SISTER JACQUELINE: If we assume that the Peace Corps has got the answer, if it could only be the great white father and go to the university, or vice versa that the university could solve it all, we are foolish. Perhaps the truth is that the Peace Corps has been long on the experiential and short on the ability to conceptualize the framework in which to do this. And the university system has become so long on the theoretical--gets to the theoretical with no induction--that they need each other. The partnership is terribly important. This is why I want to reject--at least for a while--your notion of one new institution. I want to threaten the Establishment from subversion everywhere. Many of us need to use this precious experiential commodity to subvent some more where we're trying to subvent.

MR. MICHAEL: I was just saying that we haven't been talking about this issue since lunch.

MR. FOX: How can you say we haven't talked about this? We've taken it down to a fundamental level. We're trying to put bricks in place.

MR. LANDRUM: Perhaps one illustration that the universities are caught in a status quo is that they are not leading enough people into Peace Corps service. I'm concerned that the number of Peace Corps Volunteers is not increasing and that the quality is not increasing. It would be a tragedy if the 500 Volunteer teachers in Nigeria were cut to 100. That would be a crisis--maybe not for the Volunteers, but for the Republic of Nigeria, and in any larger, world sense for the United States. That would mean 400 fewer people returning to the United States who had learned about Nigeria. I just don't think that the universities are now dealing with showing students the meaning of work in the Peace Corps.

MRS. BUNTING: The message that there is an important job to be done is not on our campuses now. And this is the thing that would bring students in, as it did in the beginning. These students are desperately looking for things that really need doing--that they can do with conviction. Why do they join the civil rights movement? The Peace Corps message is not reaching out to them. If what we want is more people, there are some central things here--that key job they are needed for abroad--and then there are some peripheral things which have to do with the machinery of admission.

MR. BERLEW: Who has to believe that there's an important job to be done in order for this message to get to the students? Do you believe it, for instance? And if you believe it, do you get that message to them so that they believe it?

MR. WIGGINS: I've been trying to think what I would do if I were a college president as a consequence of this meeting. I think I would call a meeting of the faculty to say that somewhat by chance the university is the agent of society for the broad change of the individual in terms of aspiration and motivation. We have some others in the society--such as the church--that tend to be peripheral in terms of their universality of approach to our citizens. But, quite by accident, we, the faculty and administration, are in charge of helping individuals to find their direction in the world. We are also in charge of their academic excellence, of course, but we are just as importantly in charge of the maturation and direction of the next generation. And what our university is going to do is to have an honor's program, a President's program. We are going to dignify, at the level of the president of the college, a new track that included something beyond the academic subjects. This track is going to have a number of avenues. But it's going to culminate in something like a degree.

MRS. BUNTING: This is just what I think would not get students interested.

MR. WIGGINS: Perhaps not. But if the university leadership made clear that the excellence of performance of the student body--in terms of the top honors program--is involved in experience and service, that the graduate of the school will be a superior citizen as well as a superior intellect only with that kind of a standard, many more students would give it thought.

MR. SEELEY: If I were a college president, I would go first to the students; I would go particularly to those students who are the most active, the most effective and who have already shown how much they really care about what is going on. And I would get into a conversation with them about what they care about. Then, if it were possible, I would lead them out from there to recognition of the connection between the things they are aiming at and what the Peace Corps is aiming at in the world. What would be required academically to make the university serve them is conjunction. I would build that. But I would want the surge--and I am not denigrating the faculty but I would want the primary surge--to include young people with whom we could communicate directly. It cannot be something we set up like our other schools: "This is the school of architecture--come in anyone who wants to." We must go out to meet the students where they are already operating in quasi-Peace Corps ways--where they are looking, searching as Mrs. Bunting said for something to give themselves to, something they can grow on, something in which, as part of the growing, they will learn intellectually as well.

MR. SMUCKLER: Let me overstate a proposition for the purpose of debate. I think the Peace Corps is a victim of its own autonomy. The recruitment officers come to a campus and take over in an autonomous situation, leading the recruiting drive, in a sense fighting the campus administrative battles, to get appropriate space and phone lines, and whatever else is necessary. We need a rescue from this in the form of someone to maintain interest between visits. As far as I know, I've never met a faculty member who felt he was actively participating in any of this. There's never been any involvement of the administration other than seeking clearance to come in. The same kind of statement applies to a number of other points at which the university and the Peace Corps establishment come in contact. If you want to get at university recruitment when your Peace Corps recruiter is away, so the idea of service is still being talked up actively, you work with those professors who are very much inclined towards the Peace Corps. You assist them, you reinforce them, you develop for youself, in addition to your direct approach to your students, a network of support throughout the classrooms of the university.

SPEAKER: Ralph is right. If we work more closely with the recruiting officers, if we had these materials in advance, if we could inform our area studies people, if they were sold on the idea, they could then approach the students individually and say, "Here is the program you ought to be looking at--not only for the service angle but because this fits in with your intellectual growth."

MR. PATTERSON: Maybe the Peace Corps is too conservative; maybe there are more areas where we could try harder for cooperation with universities. In fact, it might be very well if the Peace Corps Volunteer did have time for reflection. It might even perhaps enhance his experience--and theoretically enhance the doing of his job there.

MR. SZANTON: Now, what do you mean by "theoretically?" When you say something "theoretically enhances," does it or doesn't it?

MR. PATTERSON: I was referring particularly to your conference on shame and guilt. One can make a very strong case that the effect of a conference on shame and guilt on Peace Corps Volunteers in the Philippines is something that's going to have a tremendous impact upon the goals, the reasons the Volunteers are there. But there are many other kinds of conferences that are more pertinent, more direct, more pragmatic. All I'm really arguing is that in the Peace Corps context reflection is a good thing if you can do it (and as much of it as possible), but it shouldn't get in the way of getting on with the job.

MR. SEELEY: What is at issue is the kind of decision Gandhi made when, in the middle of an attempt to put the whole British Empire out of India, this lonely little man in the dhoti thought that it could not be done without at least an hour a day of meditation. Meditation! Was he abandoning the battle? Was he unpragmatic? Does this not work? Or does it indeed work in both the long and the short run? What we decide will probably have a large bearing on how we see what the problem is.

MR. SMUCKLER: We are dealing here not with a single concept of a Volunteer or of higher education. We've got a multiplicity of volunteer types. There ought to be a variety of approaches to the concept of what makes a good Peace Corpsman overseas, a variety of suggested channels through which they might be recruited and programs within which they are being placed overseas. I would hope the variety would be large enough to include some academic-type programs and some situations in which a professor-coach could visit occasionally--some situations in which universities would be playing a very major role, others in which they wouldn't.

MR. WOFFORD: Let me stand on a generality: Most Volunteers are not operating at anywhere near capacity. The theory some of us hold is that the underdevelopment of the educational aspects of the Peace Corps is one of the sources of this failure to operate at capacity. If we can find the right variety of ways to enhance the educational operations of the Peace Corps, it will generally increase the capacity of the Volunteers on the job--it will release new energy in them.

MR. RIESMAN: There is a desire and perhaps necessity to take the Peace Corps Volunteers into account in the design of the educational program. There is a range of interests, a range of satisfaction to be fulfilled. There's no rigid structure or form for such a wide range. This may be a clue.

DR. DUHL: It's the series of mechanisms that need to get built in. No matter how change-oriented you want to be, what you desperately need is somebody from the outside to ask the kinds of questions that nobody in the inside can really ask or afford to ask. In the Peace Corps the best of the Peace Corps staff cannot always do what an outsider can very well do. An outside organization primarily concerned with progress and change as a consultant to the Peace Corps is really needed. It would serve also as a consultant to the university, always raising the kinds of questions that have been raised around here, but from the outside, on a continuing basis. Many universities do this in a scattered way with many government organizations, or with other universities. Many individuals do this. I am wondering if one of the recommendations shouldn't be that we set up such a thing attached to universities, giving it freedom to serve continually as a counter-veiling force in originating what I facetiously read as "center for the militant subversion of the status quo by evolutionary process." We really do need more organizations that change organizations and whose main purposes are to help the forces that are in the university or in the Peace Corps make the kinds of changes that I think all of us want but that we can't do within our own institution.

DR. DUHL: And this is particularly difficult for the Peace Corps, a government agency with a public responsibility, to do.

A major theme now is that the experiences of Peace Corps Volunteers offer infinite opportunities for enrichment in terms of social change. Here is a tremendous opportunity for all of us not in the government to take charge and enrich this experience -- and vice-versa. A footnote is that it is much more difficult to do this in my own organization. I can use somebody from the outside to help with my own organization and I could be of help to somebody else.

MR. JOHNSON: Is there any sign of an advisory group to the Peace Corps composed of a group of representative educators?

MR. WOFFORD: There is a National Advisory Council on which some educators sit. It's not a terribly effective body and part of the responsibility for that is that the Peace Corps has never found a way to make it really effective.

DR. DUHL: These official bodies can never serve as a change agent within an organization. But it can work with a much more informal relationship.

MR. JOHNSON: It would help educators and help the Peace Corps if periodically during the year maybe two or three times, there would be such meetings as this where we could come and hear your problems as we have heard them and you could hear a bit from us. I think this would have value because what happens here gets into the minds of other educators. And for educators and universities to know that you were doing this on a rather calculated basis two or three times a year would be helpful and would establish greater cooperation between Peace Corps and education.

SPEAKER: That is what I like to call a conduit back and forth to inform people about a lot they know nothing about.

DR. DUHL: That's fine, but when I talk about a change organization it is not a conduit, it is a very active intervention process. The one model I use, as an example, is the process of intervening a psychiatrist into an individual or a family or a social structure.

SISTER JACQUELINE: Earlier someone remarked that you people have been too autonomous. It seems to me there are a lot of seemingly liberal movements that become authoritarian. The thing that fascinates me, and I have an awful time living with it, is what I would call in Bruner's terms of learning theory, "inductive administration." Bruner uses this old formula that in expository teaching you go from generalization to example; in inductive teaching, you go from action to imagery to notation. I'm fascinated with the difference especially in administration. You know the new brilliant administrator, the guy with the guts and the nerve to be the imagery maker, who waits for the notation to get inscribed. Is the Peace Corps really this kind of outfit? Can any government organization be? Are you willing to have us go out and create 175 different approaches? Will the bureaucracy take this? If it won't, you ought to face it and you ought to come up with just three plans and let us choose the one with the most advantages.

MR. RIESMAN: One of our difficulties is that the kind of vision of the Peace Corps as put forth by Mr. Wofford and then Mr. Wiggins is beyond at any rate my powers to respond to today. Being inductive, I do at least respond to concrete things if I cannot respond to the tremendous demand put upon the meeting by our host. And so I want to come back to the question of recruitment, and think why the people that the Peace Corps wants are not attracted, and what is necessary to draw them in. One of the reasons they are not attracted is because of the kind of language that comes up and that we have heard so much of today--"bureaucracy," "status quo," "establishment," all words that make people feel that what exists is square and that you can't make a dent in it. These words are very misleading.

I can think of two practical concrete steps to draw more students into the Peace Corps: (1) improve the teaching about American society and convey a less dramatic and paranoid view of our own society; (2) more Peace Corps people should write novels and diaries that would give a vivid sense of actual field experience. This should be given considerable priority. I don't let a recruiter into my classroom. I'm very jealous for the students, and of my autonomy. My classroom is not to be disturbed by anything. Nobody except a colleague comes in. But I'm happy to distribute Mr. Schickele's wonderful piece on his Nigerian experience to the students (outside of class) because I think that is the best recruiting statement I can think of. I think that if good teaching about American society and good Peace Corps literature were put into the general stream of discourse it would do a lot to change people's images of the Peace Corps.

The very fact that the Peace Corps even exists makes some people allergic to it. The fact that it's part of the American government makes some people allergic to it, as does the fact that it has been such a good thing. And all these things need to be overcome. There need to be very specific things written for the students. When these students are brought into the Peace Corps the sense of what it is will change, the dynamics which Wiggins and Wofford have been speaking of will change.

MR. LANDRUM: Would you say more about what you mean about changing the teaching about American society? I would think you need better teaching about other societies.

MR. RIESMAN: Yes that, too, but that is going on, en route you might say. A lot is done to teach the better students at the better places even an excess of cultural relativism. Many Volunteers and a number of dedicated militants that I know have compassion for every culture except their own.

But many Volunteers get in the field and come home thinking, "Well, America isn't as materialistic as Ecuador." It needs to be taught to the best of our young people that America is not beyond redemption and that it does not have to be only dealt with by chaotic ad hoc campus or civil rights organizations and that there are other ways which are fruitful. The idea has to be conveyed to the students that the Peace Corps is fruitful.

MR. BERLEW: Because of their relationships with their students, only the faculty of colleges can do this. There are two messages that need to be gotten across: (1) the Peace Corps has an important job to do in development and communication to other cultures; (2) doing this job is a very valuable experience for the person concerned. We cannot do this though we have been trying. What can we do to help you do the job for us and for yourselves as well?

MR. JOSEPHSON: No one in the Peace Corps is comfortable with the way it now approaches prospective applicants. Most of us feel very uneasy about sending people to campuses to man the booths. For those of you who commented negatively on that, I think that you should know something of the genesis of this method: the Peace Corps did not begin to do this until the academic year of 1963-1964 and did it first of all because of repeated evidence that no one in our major applicant pool--college students--had specific information about the Peace Corps and because there was no evidence that anyone with genuine influence in universities, faculty or administration, was going to exercise leadership in this regard. And so we stepped in and filled the gap, in a way that makes us all uneasy, but still we filled the gap.

SPEAKER: The colleges have to develop the intellectual rationale for taking the Peace Corps seriously and the mechanism for implementing it. Riesman won't let a recruiter into his classroom but what will he do in his own classroom which will directly help the Peace Corps? If he would tell us, we would give him all the specific information he would need.

MRS. BUNTING: The information that we need is what opportunities really are overseas. What the Volunteers are really doing and what the results are of their work.

MR. SEELEY: Mr. Riesman is close to something when he suggests that Volunteers ought to write novels or reports -- except for one detail. It seems that they had tremendous transforming experiences which they couldn't quite formulate or report on, at least not without the assistance of people like David Riesman himself. In a way this is circular. If they had continuing contact with people like you they would be writing diaries and would be ready to write their novels when they came home and would be ready to come to campus to tell their own stories. But as things are, a way of presenting themselves is not sufficiently developed so that they can do it without assistance. We need a collaboration with the people in the Peace Corps who have had the experience, who can sell the Peace Corps because of the way it has transformed them, and those who have skill in eliciting that kind of information from others, like David Riesman.

DR. DIXON: I am struck by the fact that at all levels here the practical, conceptual and methodological, the testimony suggests that communication is very poor.

MR. RIESMAN: That's a fragmentary part of the problem, Jim. The same information is beamed to all the Harvard College houses, but some houses have produced ten or a dozen Volunteers while some houses have produced none. I think this reflects the climate in these houses.

SPEAKER: What proportion of the college graduates who apply really serve?

MR. WOFFORD: One out of two who apply are invited to serve. And then only about 50 per cent of those who are invited accept the invitation. This is crucial. Only half of those invited turn up, after having applied.

DR. DIXON: College seniors have a very strong felt and expressed need to be involved in an honest and meaningful service. They do not sufficiently perceive of the Peace Corps in this light. They do not know that you really need 500 teachers in Nigeria, that this is an important enterprise, and that it is not that they have to just go out and suffer there. They don't want to be masochists. They don't see themselves as Boy Scouts. So they don't join the Peace Corps.

And many people who are at the administrative level in colleges and universities may very well have been expressing what they saw as a conflict: that the Peace Corps was one kind of enterprise and education another. This is a kind of resistance. The Peace Corps may have been seen, by many educators, as a threat.

SPEAKER: Couldn't you try during the next year an experiment? Couldn't you select a cluster of institutions, perhaps five or ten, and have them assiduously pursue a method of providing extensive information to their faculty and their counselors. Bring in their representatives responsible for promoting it on their campus and talk it over with them. And see what would happen in these schools. We would then test the idea that a lot of this is the fault of lack of communication.

MR. WOFFORD: We tried a similar experiment in Madison. We asked the university and the Peace Corps support group in that town to take responsibility for recruiting. The people who came from Washington were to be consultants and the returned Volunteers on campus were to play a large role in it. There were weaknesses, but on the whole, it was a promising approach.

SPEAKER: What the Madison program lacked was laying the responsibility squarely on the academic body and the faculty.

MR. LANDRUM: What's needed for effective recruiting at a university is not the short recruiting drive. What's needed is exactly the kind of drawing out of the personal and intellectual development that is involved in Riesman's report on the Colombia termination conference -- the careful, honest drawing out of this on a campus over a period of years so that the very bright student who cannot be caught by glib phrases is shown the benefits his work will have to him and to Nigeria, for example, as part of the normal course of his life and the world scene. We are thinking about experimenting with Peace Corps campus seminars to be run by a dynamic professor, assisted by some outstanding returned Volunteer graduate students -- perhaps ten seminars over a ten week period. The issues under discussion at these seminars and the background reading would be cultivated by this professor-Returned Volunteer team. And it might involve work in some community action projects, maybe part of a student movement project.

MR. WOFFORD: The idea is to get people to examine Peace Corps experiences or similar experiences and the related problems in a variety of forums worked out by different campuses, appropriate to the climate and to the resources and the interests of the faculty people who would be doing this.

SPEAKER: The important link between the Peace Corps and the university is the Volunteer who comes back to the campus to continue his education. This is the individual on campus who can most effectively relate the needs of the Peace Corps to the campus. I fully agree with the idea that recruitment has to be something continuing.

SISTER JACQUELINE: But who is the person who motivates most students to go on to graduate school? Is it the returned graduate school students who go back to the college or university? Or is it the conviction of the professors that graduate school is the best possible next step for a great many of the students? We're still caught here with this business of seeing the Peace Corps as extra-curricular. Does the academic world really conceive of this as a nice extra-curricular activity that ought to be added somehow as a frosting on the academic cake?

MR. RIESMAN: There is a great variety of kinds of people and services and motivations in the Peace Corps. There are people who will be drawn into it if they can be persuaded that it is 'illegitimate'. There are others who will be drawn in if we can persuade them that it is quasi-legitimate and that it will not involve too great a sacrifice, that it will not waste too much time and that it makes sense in some kind of continuity. The problem here is that the Peace Corps itself is always talking about Peace Corps in the singular and not conveying the sense that there is variety in the Peace Corps. And Peace Corps people I've met have a narrow vision of Peace Corps/Washington. This stereotype needs to be broken too.

MR. SEELEY: I have the same sense that recruiting's message sounds too much like "Uncle Sam needs you" or "Join the Navy and see the World." What the student wants to know is why he is needed, and to do what specifically, and, then, what good will that do? What sense will it make in his life? To answer these questions would require that the variety of enterprises entailed in the global Peace Corps be spelled out in sufficient detail so that one could imagine oneself doing some particular thing, and either accept or reject it.

MR. BERLEW: That's partly what the college recruitment has done, for if you go into an education class, you can then talk about the Peace Corps as an educational experience; if you go to a business administration class, you can talk about the kinds of activities relevant to business administration, and so on. This is one way in which we have particularized the message. But all too often, a professor, whose class you enter, is not concerned himself about the international aspects of his subject.

DR. DIXON: We have observed that one of the problems of the Peace Corps is that it does not behave enough like an educational institution. But I think that, quite to the contrary, it is indeed so behaving: it creates all the problems of interaction that a university does. In Eric Frommian fashion we started by presuming autonomy, initiative, industry, and trust in the behavior of individuals and social organizations. However, we find that in existing educational settings, including the Peace Corps, this is not necessarily the mode of behavior. There is a good deal of adversary behavior.

There are a number of things which we have not discussed. For example, we have not gone into the potential use of Peace Corps returnees within the educational institutions.

SPEAKER: Also there is the point of how do you get the Peace Corps into the college? Scott Buchanan's paper talked about the value of getting students overseas after their second year in college. The Peace Corps would be seen by them as part of their liberal education, not necessarily for credit, but so they would come back able to become fully educated. He suggested that there might be as many as 50 colleges in the U.S. ready to be captured by the Peace Corps, transformed by it, and perhaps willing to be geared to it.

DR. DIXON: It may be possible that productive and different relationships with colleges are possible. I would postulate two things: (1) That the colleges are running more scared than the universities. To the extent that this is true, they might very well combine with the Peace Corps ina genuinely constructive use of insecurity. (2) Because of the difference of time pressure and the idiosyncratic flexibilities that exist in some places, there is more experience at the college level in including periods of service in the total educational plan.

MR. SEELEY: The value lies in the confrontation with a reality which won't change no matter how much you may wish it it. But it is a reality which may change if you decide to act upon it. The needs of the host country and the needs of the organization are part of the educative process itself.

MR. WIGGINS: We are ready to experiment with some colleges and universities on a much more comprehensive relationship -- to go into real partnership with them. Al Carp, our head of Selection, and I, during the recess, agreed to make a proposal to you.

There are some things that the Peace Corps cannot give up -- final responsibility for selection of Volunteers, for example. The selection system is now roughly as follows: We recruit, a person submits a questionnaire and then takes a placement test. Peace Corps runs that questionnaire through a broad screen. Very few college students drop out at that point. Then we get letters of reference back and on the basis of all this, we make a broad judgment as to whether he seems to be the quality of American who would do well abroad. Then he goes to classification and is classified against the 46 countries and the 300 different kinds of jobs available. The invitation goes out, acceptance comes back in and we then have a Civil Service investigation of the individual. He then enters training and, based upon his performance in training and all that we have known before, including the Civil Service investigation, we have a final selection.

In light of this discussion, I propose that there be a significant modification of that on an experimental basis, working with select institutions. With these schools which would like to be involved more deeply with the Peace Corps, we would first, instead of approaching them through routine recruiting, have a meeting with the faculty and those in the administration who are concerned and knowledgeable about what the students want to do and ask them to go over with us all of the students. We would then together divide the students into two categories: those who are ill, married with children, have clear health problems, or who otherwise would be disqualified through our standards of processing, and those who are not clearly ineligible. We then would carry out the process of classification thinking through all those people they faculty would advocate for the Peace Corps, specifying the kind of assignment as well as the country for which they should be invited.

Then the faculty adviser would go to the student and say: "We've talked you over with the Peace Corps and we think that one alternative you ought to consider after graduation is going to Colombia in rural community development." Or he might say, "Consider this as an alternative to graduate study or whatever you had in mind. You are being invited to join the Peace Corps for this particular job -- teaching English in Nigeria."

This would reverse the whole procedure -- the invitation to apply would be a joint judgment made by the school and the Peace Corps. We would involve the faculty in thinking about what we are doing. The faculty would have to understand enough about community development in Colombia or teaching in Nigeria to come out with a judgment. Based upon that invitation, we would then (there would be a couple of possible variations here) agree to put people into training. The final selection would remain with the Peace Corps in the end. But this would then involve the faculty, the student, and the Peace Corps thinking this through together.

SISTER JACQUELINE: What bothers me in this process is that adults decide which students should be considered and then present it to them. This seems to me to be anti-education. What I want to see kids develop in this society is the ability to structure for themselves out of a lot of chaotic parts. I would fight against this tendency to hand them a bill of fare.

MR. WIGGINS: What I described would in no sense be an exclusive process.

SISTER JACQUELINE: Don't you think you could get the kind of involvement you were talking about without having the faculty make the decision?

SPEAKER: The experiment would have the faculty simply say, "We know you and you ought to think about the Peace Corps in this particular setting in this particular foreign country."

MR. SEELEY: It may be just a matter of the order of things, but I would like to see the question come from the students and then, if you had done this other work, they would know which faculty member to go to, to talk about whether they personally are suited for Peace Corps work, and, if so, for which particular kind and where.

SISTER JACQUELINE: If your group is going to come in and educate the faculty, why can't the forum be open and why can't we try to get a group of students in at the same time and have the whole college community be educated to this? Then let the student decide and ask for a faculty sponsor if the student wishes.

MR. SEELEY: Instead of making the prime contact with the university administration, suppose we were to consider making it with the students -- with the whole student group, not just the official student body, but the student revolt group as well. You would then be helping the students make the decision whether they should go into the South, or into the Peace Corps or what have you. This student group might also have faculty sponsors, but it would be a joint committee, and the primary responsibility would be the students.

SPEAKER: There are usually faculty identified with the student revolt groups. It is crucial that you not leave the faculty out.

MR. SEELEY: There may be two quite separate things here: conducting the joint selection experiment with the faculty and finding a way to get the Peace Corps or VISTA confrontations with student leaders -- confrontations that would be candid and alive.

MR. WOFFORD: Mr. Shriver went to Berkeley and said that the other side of the coin of civil disobedience was constructive service -- that you needed both to be a whole and effective person politically. And he invited them into the Peace Corps. It was an opening line. I guess that the Peace Corps has a very low proportion of the people who sat outside of Sproul Hall at Berkeley.

MR. CARP: I know we have some. There seems to be essential assent to the notion of the recruiting, selection experiment, including all the various conditions.

MRS. BUNTING: May I add that I think that is true about many of the things that have been said here today. In fact, I think there is even a lot to be said about the new university idea. The fact that we went at it with whatever analytical tools we had doesn't mean that we don't think it should not be looked into more thoroughly. There is a great deal, too, to be said about the foundation idea. I could see a foundation's supporting projects from different colleges that want to do something, for example, about getting people into the Peace Corps -- or a tremendous variety of other things that are in tune with your objectives. I could see this as awfully useful. There have been a great many things expressed here that it would be too bad to have go by without future action.

DR. DIXON: My particular thanks to Mr. Wiggins -- for he has pulled us down to one very small motion to test whether we have a capacity for agreement.

MR. WIGGINS: Let me make one more point. Although there are great differences on the Peace Corps staff, on the basis of personalities, background and experience, still it is probably easier for you to get a grip on us than for us to get a grip on your faculty and your students. And thus I hope that it is the academic community that takes the initiative. We are a long way from the student body. We have some in-roads, in terms of understanding them, and there are some people who are close to them, but, by and large, the Peace Corps is a long way from them. And after four and a half years, we are still quite far away from most of the faculties of most of the universities. This group here today is unique in that you, on the education side, understand us. And you also are in the position to understand the faculties and student bodies far better than we. And thus the initiative out of this for experimentation, for a new proposal, for how to make the links in the bridge, really rests more with you than with us.

We spend $2 million in recruiting and writing brochures and still people say, "What are you doing abroad?" We could increase that expenditure to $3 million or try to go back and figure out how to write it all differently and better for the umpteenth time. But this need ought to be left to your initiative. If we can communicate to you on what kind of jobs there are abroad and what the countries are, maybe you can pin=point our inadequacies better than we can. You can tell us how we can reach the students, how we can involve the faculty, what we can do next. We have really failed, for four and a half years in general, in involving faculty in the broader issues of the Peace Corps.

MR. RIESMAN: When you say you've failed, you put it too negatively. Your judgment of the world you're dealing with isn't quite straight. There's been a lot of talk as if there are cadres of students who are in contact with each other. But there are a lot of student isolates whom it would be extremely difficult to reach. There are many faculty isolates. There are 60 professors of political science at Berkeley, for example -- that's a sub-community. They don't meet other people because they prescribe a sufficient agenda for themselves. If you thought of it as 46-plus different countries, you would realize what an incredible job it is to achieve communication.

And then I sit here and think of the 2,000 institutions in this country and all the different levels of all of them. We've been talking today about the dissident students. Nine-tenths of the campuses would be gratified if they had any such.

DR. DIXON: There seems to be a kind of cultural habit among educational organizations not to interfere in each other's affairs. They give generously of time and consultation, and respond generously to requests for help but avoid telling another educational organization how it could best accomplish its mission. It is not in their nature to take much initiative in entering in another organization's program. It is in their nature, however, to be enormously responsive when they are asked by another educational institution for help.

One thing I meant, Mr. Wiggins, by my comment was that as I listened to Mr. McClure's talk about the need for recruits, and then listened to Mr. Wofford talk, and I think rightly, about the need for growth, it just doesn't seem to me that academics respond to that kind of sense of urgency.

THE TASK FORCE ON A NEW EDUCATION PROGRAM

Excerpts from Sargent Shriver's Memorandum of August 13, 1965

The education of Volunteers must be seen as a continuous process, beginning when college students and other Americans first consider joining the Peace Corps, becoming intense during the months of training, continuing throughout their service overseas, and not even ending after their return. This is a powerful kind of education: learning by doing and by living--by personal involvement--in the most direct form.

The Training Division has made good progress in developing the training part of this process. From the lessons learned in training, and from evaluation of our work, we can now take further steps to improve the whole process. We can organize new programs of discussion on campuses for those interested in joining the Peace Corps. We can prepare new materials that convey the complexity and challenge of the overseas experience. We can enlist greater participation by outstanding returned Volunteers in communicating this experience. In training programs, we can make the curriculum more truly reflect the demands and enlarge the possibilities of the work and life of Volunteers overseas, so that it is not merely an extension of conventional academic courses. And we can take steps to expand and enhance the educational process overseas in ways that will contribute directly to greater job performance by the Volunteers.

With this view of the Peace Corps as an educational venture from beginning to end, we can appeal to and involve many of the best teachers and academic leaders in America. We can enlist them in campus programs for potential applicants, in training programs and in overseas work, including participation in completion of service conferences.

To work out the plans which will move training from a three-month operation to a two- or three-year process of Volunteer education, and to initiate a number of new education programs that will embody and demonstrate these ideas, and to attract the kind of faculty needed, we have asked Harris Wofford to head a special task force.

The aim will be to devise programs of new appeal and excellence that require outstanding academic leaders, outstanding institutions, and outstanding curriculums. By doing this now, we and the men and institutions responsible will have lead time to develop truly new and excellent programs. And we and they will have time to get the story about these new programs to the campuses of the country.

We invite your ideas. For the Peace Corps to remain new and to renew itself, the months ahead must be ones of innovation and improvement.

EXCERPTS FROM A WORKING PAPER ON THE PEACE CORPS AND ACADEMY

by
Scott Buchanan

My main thesis is in three parts. One, our educational establishment is in a state of transition and of consequent disarray; perhaps the disarray is most acute in the American college. Two, the Peace Corps has had perhaps a too rapid success. Its home base is inadequate for the function that it has discovered for itself. Both the preparation and the reception of the Volunteers are thin and weak. Three, if the colleges can rally their moral, intellectual, and spiritual forces to meet the needs of the Peace Corps, we may expect a kind of Elizabethan Age for the world.

Toynbee has said that Western civilization is penetrating the rest of the world. Previous civilizations have penetrated other civilizations in many ways, military, political, commercial, technological, evangelical. Western civilization has been penetrating the rest of the world for four hundred years in all these ways. But now the penetration has become reciprocal and more intense than ever before. We are frightened by it, but happily we may be wise enough to accept the counter-penetration with intelligence and good-will, and make the whole process mutual. It may fall to the academy and the Peace Corps as an arm of the academy to provide the intellectual and moral power that is required. I believe the new generation is asking and searching for the vision that will enlighten that power.

In my paper for the March Conference on the Returned Peace Corps Volunteer I proposed that the colleges, at least some of them, accept the assignment of providing the liberal education that would prepare the Peace Corps Volunteers for their two-year tour of duty and also welcome them back for a liberal educational interpretation and assimilation of their experience. This scheme would involve two years of preparation, two years of service abroad, and two years of interpretation. Some Volunteers might be chosen to continue with graduate work and teaching, some might go on to other careers in the community. The colleges might grow in purpose and effectiveness as they participate in the growing purposes of the Peace Corps.

I am happily surprised to find that others at the March meeting had similar ideas and at present are pursuing them in action. I should not be surprised, and I am not surprised, to see that these ideas and plans have suffered a reduction typical in our time. My emphasis above on liberal education is lost and programs of vocational or quasi-professional training have taken its place. The needs for some special training for the Peace Corps are obvious and should be honored, but the Peace

Corps and its high purposes would be frustrated and short-changed if the liberal dimensions of education are forgotten. The implications of "cross-cultural shock" should not be allowed to collapse into a professional cliche. The interpenetration of civilizations, as experienced by a Peace Corps Volunteer, needs the unlimited understanding and interpretation that the liberal arts can provide. Both the colleges and the Peace Corps need high ceilings and broad horizons if they are to recover from banality and their prostitution to immediate utility.

If the liberal college is to serve as home base for the Peace Corps, there is no reason to find a substitute for the traditional disciplines of language and mathematics, which are flourishing in their contemporary separate uses. The layman's study of law should be reinstated in the liberal college in order to bring genuine politics to the puzzled citizen who now gasps and gropes in the flood of new knowledge in the natural and social sciences. Whatever has been conceived as the master study in colleges and universities in the past, it is quite clear now that law and politics must take the key position. Local law, national law, world law must be the supports to keep both civilization and education from collapsing over our heads. As Einstein said, the only way now to think about human destiny is in terms of politics. It seems that the Peace Corps appears at a providential time to aid education in performing its essential function.

Perhaps I ought to add that I am not as sanguine about fulfillment of this program as this brief proposal may seem to indicate. The colleges and the universities are not immediately able to accept the assignment. They are for various reasons operating without clear purpose or direction; the spirit of good teaching is missing. They are suffering from an explosion of new knowledge as well as an explosion of population, and there is no adequate institutional response. It may therefore be the duty of the Peace Corps to set up institutes of training, that will build upon the present programs in the direction of true liberal education. The Peace Corps can conceive itself as the new college or university and hope to build a model for the academy to follow later.

Excerpts from Letter to Sargent Shriver
from President James P. Dixon of Antioch

At the conference for returning volunteers, I had the opportunity to get a first-hand look into the concerns of both the Peace Corps administrative staff and the volunteers and to talk with educators about these concerns.

First, let me say that it seems to me that the Peace Corps is the most eloquent example of institutionalizing academic freedom within the federal government that has ever existed. Perhaps precisely because the Peace Corps offers more academic freedom to the young than do many colleges and universities to their students does it exhibit an appearance of deeper conflict. The conflict is present in both places--because of large and unsettled issues--but in the Peace Corps it is more visible because reflection and expression are (wisely) encouraged.

It is not unnatural--though it disturbed me to hear it--that many volunteers have agonizing uncertainties as to whether the freedom is genuine or specious, whether behind the ostensible intent to grant freedom there lies "really" only a "manipulative" intent to afford catharsis. A smaller but still sizeable number had indeed more or less tentatively concluded that the Peace Corps had the characteristics of conspiracy and manipulation which they had experienced and learned to expect elsewhere, but could not tolerate in their image of the blessed and beloved company. In one way this is even more disturbing; in another it marks an extraordinary educational opportunity, for which you have evidently set the stage. I was also concerned to hear that returning volunteers felt that the American educational establishment was not sufficiently responsive to their desire for a greater democracy in the conduct of academic affairs and for a much more vigorous consideration by the colleges and universities of the academic meaning of the experiences that they had gained.

These same conflicts of students with the establishment exist in colleges and universities. That is to say, both the Peace Corps and the academic establishment feel the thrust from young people for democracy and the demand that a wide variety of work and community service be considered as contributing to the requirements for award of recognition and perhaps degrees.

In short, the academic establishment and the Peace Corps, in these terms, desperately need each other. A number of us at the conference believe that there are specific ways to move ahead from this point. We would like to suggest the possibility of continuing the dialogue which commenced at the conference in a small group, including yourself and your top staff, two or three people from the educational establishment, a couple of students and Peace Corps volunteers. Such a continuing conversation would, I think, develop rather quickly the specific ways in which we can develop our existing good plans and intentions in order to set free from this most unusual reservoir of talent and moral force the human service that today's young people demand that they be permitted to provide.

GSA DC PC 66-2882